



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Lectures on

Old Testament History



Lectures on Certain Portions  
OF THE EARLIER  
OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

BY

PHILIP G. MUNRO,

PRIEST OF THE DIOCESE OF NOTTINGHAM, AND DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN  
TO THE EARL OF GAINSBOROUGH.

Revela oculos meos, et considerabo mirabilia in opere tua.



VOL. I.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES,  
Portman Street and Paternoster Row.

1873.

101. i. 695.

**Nihil obstat.**

THOMAS G. LAW,  
*Cong. Orat. Censor Deputatus.*

**Imprimatur.**

✠ HENRICUS EDUARDUS,  
*Archiep. Westmonast.*

In Festo S. Mathias 1873.

**Imprimatur.**

✠ RICHARDUS,  
*Episc. Nottinghamensis.*

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
THE EARL OF GAINSBOROUGH,  
LORD-LIEUTENANT OF THE COUNTY OF RUTLAND,

IN MEMORY OF AND IN GRATITUDE FOR  
THE MANY ACTS OF KINDNESS  
RECEIVED AT HIS LORDSHIP'S HANDS  
DURING THE ELEVEN YEARS PASSED UNDER HIS ROOF,

*These Lectures*

ARE MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED BY

THE AUTHOR.



## PREFACE.

---

THE Author's intention originally was to have published in a single volume a series of Lectures which should, in their subject-matter, cover the entire Book of Genesis.

But having completed the fifth Lecture, it occurred to him that he had reached a natural division of the series, and that it might be better to send to the press what he had already written; reserving the second half of the series, which would embrace the lives of the Patriarchs from Noe to Joseph, to form a second volume, should the publication be called for.

The importance of the subjects treated in the present volume can hardly be overrated, and must be the Author's apology for presenting himself before the Catholic public. If it

should induce any of his brethren in the Priesthood, more fitted for the work than himself, to follow his example and enter on the same field, one great end will certainly have been gained, viz. the increased study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures on the part of the Catholic laity.

It may be well to say, that there is very little in these Lectures that is original. The nucleus of the entire work consists of notes taken during the Author's collegiate life, the ideas of which have been developed or modified, as it happened, by his own reading during the last ten years.

In conclusion, the Author begs to submit most unreservedly every word that he has written to the infallible judgment of the Church of God.

Exton House,

Feast of the Annunciation, 1873.

## CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

---

LECT.	PAGE
PRELIMINARY LECTURE . . . .	I
I. THE CREATION . . . .	29
II. THE CREATION OF MAN . . . .	82
III. THE TEMPTATION. THE FALL . . . .	111
IV. SACRIFICES OF CAIN AND ABEL. LAMECH .	144
V. EARLY USE OF THE WORD <i>Jehovah</i> . HENOC	170



# LECTURES,

ETC.

---

PRELIMINARY LECTURE

---

## ERRATUM.

Page 41, line 22, *for* Parmian *read* Permian.

Church. At the same time, as we must necessarily be interpreters, it will be well for us to bear in mind the great dogmatic laws of interpretation which the Church herself has laid down. They are, 1st, that all Scripture is divinely inspired: 2dly, that it belongs to the Church, and to her alone, to give the *sense* of Scripture. As to the first law, without entering

at all on the subject of the *extent* or limits of inspiration, we may deduce clearly from it that no inspired writer can contradict himself or any other inspired writer; that there is nothing in Holy Scripture at variance with any truth, whether historical or philosophical; and this, for the simple reason that truth cannot be at variance with itself, the Source of all Truth and the Author of Scripture being no other than the Spirit of Truth, God Himself. As to the second law, it is clearly proved in dogmatic theology that our Blessed Lord established in His Church a pastoral authority, an infallible teacher of the faith delivered to the Apostles, and that that authority is the appointed guardian and interpreter of the Scriptures.

In accordance with this, the Council of Trent decreed that no one should presume to interpret the Scriptures in a sense contrary to that which the Church has held and holds, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> 'Ad coercenda petulantia ingenia decernit (S. Synodus) ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei et morum, ad edificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judi-

Catholic interpreter, therefore, will learn the sense of Scripture in the same way that he learns the rest of Christian doctrine, viz. by consulting and listening reverently to his Divine Teacher, the Church of Christ; for the sense of Scripture was divinely impressed on the mind of the Church by her Divine Founder, from the beginning of her existence; that sense being, in matter of fact, nothing more nor less than the depositum of faith, which it was the Church's duty and office to guard, interpret, and develope according as occasion should serve. Now the Church may make known the sense of any passage of Scripture in two ways: viz. either *directly*, or *indirectly*. She makes it known *directly* either by a solemn definition, or by the universal consent of the dispersed Church from the earliest times. She makes it known *indirectly* when she tells us that we are to interpret Scripture 'according to the analogy of faith;' in such a way, that is, that our interpre-

---

care de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sacrarum, aut etiam contra unanimum consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sanctam interpretari.'—Sess. iv. de Canonicis Scripturis.

tation shall be in harmony with her teaching upon all other points of Christian doctrine. As to the universal assent of the dispersed Church, we may learn this from the writings of the Fathers, who themselves were but exponents of the mind of the one living Divine Teacher. But in order to be *bound* by the interpretation of the Fathers, the Council of Trent tells us that that interpretation must be morally unanimous, and moreover, on some point in connection with faith or morals. If the Fathers speak hesitatingly on any such point, the law of Trent does not oblige us to adhere to their interpretation, but leaves us free to interpret for ourselves, provided we do so according to the analogy of faith.

With these preliminary remarks we may enter on our studies.

What strikes us very forcibly in reading the Holy Scriptures generally, but more particularly the earlier portions of the Old Testament, with which we shall more immediately concern ourselves, is the circumstance that a great deal more meaning is usually implied than expressed. I mean that the words are

pregnant, and require to be examined and unfolded in order to give them their full meaning. This peculiarity of Scripture had no doubt many wise purposes to answer; and it is no mere conjecture to say, that one of these purposes was to indicate, indirectly, the process by which God intended that the Scriptures should be understood in the individual mind. They were not intended to tell their whole tale at once, independent of oral instruction, but to reveal their meaning more and more according to the study and faith of the individual, acting under obedience to the living voice of a Teacher from God. The Scriptures differ in this respect from all human writings. These can be understood at once, provided the mind be applied to them and be sufficiently disciplined to follow the author's train of thought. There is no such thing as meaning hidden behind meaning in human writings. Once we have mastered them, we know the whole of their contents. Not so with Holy Scripture. After we have critically studied the language of the Scriptures, accumulated all external information bearing on its matter, availed ourselves of all the aids which

the Church provides for her children, even then we have not exhausted its meaning.

‘It is in point,’ says Dr. Newman,<sup>2</sup> ‘to notice also the structure and style of Scripture; a structure so unsystematic and various, and a style so figurative and indirect, that no one would presume, at first sight, to say what is in it and what is not. It cannot, as it were, be mapped, or its contents catalogued; but after all our diligence, to the end of our lives, and to the end of the Church, it must be an unexplored and unsubdued land, with heights and valleys, forests and streams, on the right and left of our path and close about us, full of concealed wonders and choice treasures. Of no doctrine whatever, which does not actually contradict what has been delivered, can it be peremptorily asserted that it is not in Scripture: of no reader, whatever be his study of it, can it be said that he has mastered every doctrine which it contains.’ And in keeping with this, we find that the great Doctors of the Church in every age, taking as their landmarks the teaching of their Mother, have ever made it their

<sup>2</sup> *Theory of Development*, p. 110.

duty to meditate on the Sacred Writings, to dig deeper and deeper, so to say, in their study of them, the more meaning they found the more appearing to remain beneath. Thus we can see that Scripture was intended to reveal its meaning only under the illuminating grace of God; according to the expression, 'Light is sown for the just.' Light is implanted, as it were, like a seed throughout the whole of Scripture; and it is the *just* man, the man, that is, that is living up to his religious principles, the humble learner, sitting at the feet of God's Teacher, and he only, not the merely critical and intellectual man, that has that light gradually developed.<sup>3</sup>

Another reason, perhaps, for this peculiarity of the Sacred Writings is the nature of prophecy, which seems to require for its proper action a process of gradual development, making itself more and more distinct as time goes

<sup>3</sup> 'The normal state of the reason is that of a disciple illuminated, elevated, guided, and unfolded to strength and perfection by the action of a Divine Teacher. The abnormal is that of a critic, testing, measuring, limiting the matter of Divine Revelation by his supposed discernment or intuition.'—*Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, by his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster; Introduction, p. 3.

on, and not disclosing the whole truth from the first, as it was intended to adapt itself to the history of mankind. We accordingly find that the prophecies of the Old Testament are pregnant. They do not speak out their whole meaning at once, but disclose it more and more as time goes on, and the circumstances of mankind alter, still requiring for their complete understanding a knowledge of their fulfilment.

Dr. Newman puts forward this same idea in his own forcible language: 'Prophecy,' he says, 'if it had so happened, need not have afforded a specimen of development: separate predictions might have been made to accumulate as time went on, prospects might have opened, definite knowledge might have been given by communications independent of each other, as St. John's Gospel or the Epistles of St. Paul are unconnected with the first three Gospels, though the doctrine of each Apostle is a development of their matter. But the revelation is, in matter of fact, not of this nature, but a process of development; the earlier prophecies are pregnant texts out of which the succeeding

announcements grow; they are types. It is not that first one truth is told, and then another; but the whole truth, or large portions of it, are told at once, yet only in their rudiments or in miniature, and they are expanded and finished in their parts as the course of revelation proceeds. The seed of the woman was to bruise the serpent's head; the sceptre was not to depart from Judah till Shiloh came, to whom was to be the gathering of the people. He was to be Wonderful, Counsellor, the Prince of Peace.<sup>4</sup>

These peculiarities of the Holy Scriptures constitute the great difficulty in the way of attaining to their sense. And if we are to gain anything towards our souls' health in these studies, we must approach them in humility and submission to God's appointed Teacher upon earth. It is evident that the mere critical study of Holy Scriptures, such as has grown out of Protestantism, is quite insufficient to enable a man even to attain to its meaning. And if proof be wanting, we have only to look around us, and witness the jarring of the countless sects that

<sup>4</sup> F. Newman's *Theory of Development*, p. 102.

have sprung up in Protestant countries, notably in England, in consequence of the adoption of such a study. This was the logical result of the reversal of the order established by God. The truth is, that in no age was it God's will that Holy Scripture should comprise within its words a complete statement of all religious truth. There has ever been a Church of God, a society possessing and preserving intact a clear traditional knowledge of truth, so far as the revelation went, and that quite independent of any writing or collection of writings. Of course this is so under the Gospel dispensation. Our Blessed Lord founded His Church, committed to her the depositum of truth, commissioned her to teach that truth to all nations, and promised to be with her so teaching till He should come again. Under such teaching, a little Christian child understands more clearly revealed truth than the most learned and intellectual adult could possibly do, were he left to his own unaided reason to interpret the words of Scripture. Take, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity, the fundamental dogma of the Christian revelation.

Would, say Plato, who had never heard of that doctrine, have even discovered it by applying his gigantic mind to the critical study of the words of Scripture? That he would have done so is simply inconceivable.

This, then, which is the case now, was still the case while Holy Scripture was yet in its growth, and its canon undetermined; nay, it was so when as yet there was no Scripture at all; *e.g.* under the patriarchal dispensation, when the promises of God were infallibly preserved by Divine tradition. The knowledge of religious truth which the Patriarchs possessed must necessarily have been far larger than that which an individual now could get merely by perusing the pages of the Book of Genesis. There was a patriarchal body, a patriarchal Church, in which there was a system of religious education, clear and distinct, so far as it went; a ceremonial and sacraments, by which men were trained towards God and taught the knowledge of the truth. That patriarchal Church, simply because it was God's ordinance, was a guide sure and infallible, to the extent of the then revelation. It had all the essen-

tials of a Teacher from God: clear, though partial, knowledge, and a distinct infallible utterance.<sup>5</sup>

This is a most important thing to bear in mind, because Infidelity, Rationalism, and heresy in its every form, are always taking advantage of the brevity of Holy Scripture, its want of explicitness, to the disparagement of its teaching and of religion in general. For instance, the circumstance of the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body, not being explicitly stated in the Books of Moses, has been made the ground for asserting that those truths were not known

<sup>5</sup> This same idea, of the infallible teaching of Almighty God under all dispensations, seems to underlie the following passage from a well-known work, *Etudes philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, p. 308, by M. Auguste Nicolas: 'If we consider, first, the Jewish people in antiquity, it is impossible not to be struck by the colossal fact of a whole people, a whole nation, surpassing all others in antiquity, and traversing all ages in the very midst of universal idolatry and degradation, while bearing intact the deposit of the natural law, of primitive religion, of the belief in and worship of one *only* God, spiritual, holy, all-powerful, Father and Judge of all men; such, in fact, as the whole earth worships now, and the world then was ignorant of. . . . All the nations illumined originally by the light of natural religion were not long before they saw that light expire, and lost themselves in the paths of superstition and idolatry. They plunged deeper and deeper in it, and nothing could draw them out

at that time, and that all that holy men of old were looking to, all that, in fact, the Church of Israel desired and hoped for, lay on this side death; and that life and immortality were *in no sense* brought to light before the coming of the Gospel. Such a distinction between former dispensations and the Christian—an entire distinction in regard to the objects of religious knowledge, one set of truths having reference to mere earthly things,—that distinction is turned to the disparagement of the Christian revelation. It is important, then, to bear in mind that the Patriarchs, and the patriarchal body generally, had a clear, definite, practical

---

of it. . . . So far had the human mind lost sight of the truth which the Jews alone had preserved. Is not this a real prodigy in the moral order? How had the Jews alone escaped this universal shipwreck of the reason? How had they, and they alone, managed to maintain themselves on the level of the primitive truth, and to resist the inclination and the tendency of the human mind towards error—they who were more ancient than all other nations, and who consequently should have aged and become corrupted much sooner—they who, moreover, were naturally not less gross, not less carnal, not less affected by that moral wound which inwardly gnaws all mortal men? How are we to explain such a phenomenon? As to myself, I proclaim it—because it is a profound conviction of the reason as much as of faith—I explain this phenomenon of the preservation of religious truth among this people only through the same means that had given it originally to the earth—Revelation, the inter-

knowledge of religious truth : that they formed part of a living body, under a living Teacher, and so had a much wider knowledge of truth than the mere words of Holy Scripture, had they possessed them, could have conveyed to isolated minds. It is quite certain, even from the words of Scripture, that this was the case. We know that the Patriarchs had their *places* of worship. They did not merely worship God under the vault of heaven. They had places set apart for divine worship. The phrase 'before the Lord' frequently occurs, and in a *local*

---

vention of the Divinity. The source of divine communications, whence sprung the truth which shone in the intelligence of the first man, remained open in the midst of this people, and bubbled forth intermittently from the mouth of the Patriarchs and Prophets; showing itself by facts and events which continually called men's minds back to the truth, combated the tendency of hearts towards idolatry, kept them within the paths of the ancient tradition, and rendered visible for them the presence of the Divinity, until that presence had burst forth over the whole earth in the person of Christ and in His Church.'

And again: 'For this people, there was a channel of tradition hermetically sealed, which transmitted to it incorruptibly the primitive truth, and gave forth exactly to it the sounds of the voice of its ancestors and of the voice of the Creator' (ib. p. 312).

Once more: 'The Jewish people remained the inviolable depositary of the most spiritual truths; it never allowed itself to be led away by the seductive novelties which tempted it on all sides' (ib. p. 312).

sense. Cain and Abel, *e.g.*, brought their offerings to a certain spot; and when Cain was banished, he 'went out from the face of the Lord,'<sup>6</sup> which in regard to God's omnipresence would have been, of course, impossible. The reference therefore must be to a local presence, to a place in which God met His worshippers, and made Himself known to them either by a glory, or by answer to prayer, or some other sensible means. Again, in the case of Abraham,<sup>7</sup> after the angel had left him, and gone towards Sodom, 'Abraham as yet stood before the Lord.' Rebecca, when the children struggled in her womb,<sup>8</sup> 'went to consult the Lord.' The same expression is used of the Tabernacle: 'He shall offer a male without blemish at the door of the testimony.'<sup>9</sup>

The Patriarchs, then, clearly believed that in certain places, especially consecrated to His Service, God would be best propitiated and served. But the statement of that fact is not clearly made in the Books of Moses. We simply find allusions to the practice as part of a reli-

<sup>6</sup> Gen. iv. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Ib. xxv. 22.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. xviii. 22.

<sup>9</sup> Lev. i. 4.

gious system appointed by God. Then again, besides *places* of worship, there were ministers, special persons set apart to officiate, and to offer sacrifice. The instance of Melchisedek shows this: 'He was Priest of the most high God.' And Abraham must have been quite familiar with the character of the priestly office, from the respect he showed Melchisedek, and his receiving a blessing from him; 'without all contradiction that which is less is blessed by the greater.'<sup>10</sup>

Then there were Prophets, whose office was not merely to see in vision and to announce distant events, whether past, present, or future, but to teach and to preach in God's name and by His authority. Adam, in ecstasy, foreknew the espousal of Christ with His Church, and by his own marriage with Eve prefigured it: moreover he expressly announced the indissolubility of marriage henceforth, 'wherefore shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.'<sup>11</sup> Thus with Adam may be said to have begun the first preaching of morals. It is highly probable,

<sup>10</sup> Heb. vii. 7.

<sup>11</sup> Gen. ii. 24.

too, if not certain, that Adam instructed both Cain and Abel in the knowledge of their religious duties, more particularly of the duty of Sacrifice, as being the great act of worship from the creature to the Creator. Then there was Enoch, who 'walked with God,' and was taken into Paradise, that he might preach penance to the nations: 'Of these Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to reprove all the ungodly for all the works of their ungodliness, whereby they have done ungodly, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against God.'<sup>12</sup> Noe, again, prophesied of the Deluge, and by his building of the Ark, for the safety of himself and family, was a 'preacher of justice.' The cases, too, of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Balaam, and Job, distinctly show us how God provided from the beginning a set of men who should proclaim His truth and teach the way of salvation. All these were teachers from God, and *θεοδιδάκτοι*, and therefore infallible in their teaching 'whether

<sup>12</sup> Ep. of St. Jude, 14, 15.

men would hear, or whether they would forbear.'

The system of religion under the Patriarchs had also its ceremonies and customs. There was the consecration ceremonial, by which places were set apart for worship, by anointing with oil; as at Bethel, when Jacob anointed the pillar, and poured a drink-offering on it. There was the ceremony of unbaring the feet on entering consecrated places, which is still observed in the East, having reference probably to the passage of Ecclesiastes: 'Keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of God, and draw nigh to hear.'<sup>13</sup> There was also a posture for worship, viz. the bowing down to the ground in prayer before the Lord; a special day for the special performance of religious duties, the Sabbath, the institution of which dates from the Creation, appearing in the Book of Genesis by the mention of weeks. Noe, we are told, 'waited yet seven other days,' and 'sent forth the dove out of the ark.'<sup>14</sup> 'And he stayed yet other seven days, and he sent forth the dove, which returned not any more unto him.'<sup>15</sup> And

<sup>13</sup> Eccle. iv. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Gen. viii. 10.

<sup>15</sup> Ib. viii. 12.

before the giving of the Ten Commandments, it is spoken of as a *Sabbath* : ' And he said to them, This is what the Lord hath spoken : to-morrow is the rest of the Sabbath, sanctified to the Lord.'<sup>16</sup> And in the 27th verse of the same chapter we have that Sabbath spoken of as the seventh day : ' And the seventh day came, and some of the people going forth to gather (the manna) found none.'

Besides these external features of a living teaching Church, we find the distinction made between clean and unclean in animals, which distinction evidently had reference to the Divine institution of Sacrifice, the appointment of which we nowhere read of in Scripture. Nor are we told *what* animals were fit and what unfit for that holy rite. That Noe would of course get by Divine tradition. He was to take by sevens of the clean, and by twos of the unclean. We find many other particulars of the same nature : *e. g.* the purification necessary when people approached any holy place : ' And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and feet when they went into the tabernacle of the

<sup>16</sup> Exod. xvi. 23.

covenant, and went to the altar, as the Lord had commanded Moses.<sup>17</sup> Already too, under the patriarchal system, marriage with the uncircumcised was prohibited. Yet all these are merely alluded to in the Book of Genesis. They do not appear as truths, rites, or ordinances revealed for the first time, but as parts of a practical, living, religious system divinely held together.

The main feature, however, of the patriarchal Church, viz. Sacrifice, requires a more particular notice. We do not read anywhere of the institution of the rite of Sacrifice, nor is there any command mentioned for offering sacrifice till we come to the Mosaic time; but the allusions in the Book of Genesis show that sacrifices were continually going on, and in some cases—as *e.g.* in Gen. xv.—sacrifices of a very peculiar nature and a highly ceremonial character. We find Abraham by God's command offering not merely a lamb or a bullock, but 'a cow of three years old, and a she-goat of three years, and a ram of three years; a turtle also, and a pigeon.'<sup>18</sup> This sacrifice, and

<sup>17</sup> Exod. xl. 29, 30.

<sup>18</sup> Gen. xv. 9.

the subsequent appearance of the furnace and lamp of fire passing between the divisions of the victims at sunset, constituted the rite by which God entered into covenant with Abraham to give to his posterity possession of the land of Canaan, and shadowed forth the various afflictions they would undergo before entering it.

Now in regard to Sacrifice there can be no doubt whatever that it was the great witness which practical religion bore everywhere to the central truth of Divine revelation, viz. the death of Jesus Christ for a perishing world; that that was the object of it in the sight of God; that Sacrifice was the memorial before the Eternal Father of the death of His Divine Son on the Cross for man's redemption, and the provision made by Him for enabling man to worship Him as His creature, and to plead the merits of Jesus previous to the Incarnation. The effect, too, of such sacrifices on the people who assisted at them was at once devotional, and formative of certain religious habits. Whether the offerer distinctly connected what he did in the act of sacrifice with the promise of a future

Redeemer, as he might have done, or not, still he learnt a great deal by his habit of sacrificing. He was schooled by it into a due acknowledgment of God as His Creator, taught humility, and a dependence upon something of God's providing for his acceptance with Him; the tendency of every sacrifice manifestly being to impress upon man, practically, a sense of his own unworthiness to appear before God without some atonement; to teach him that without some death or suffering undergone on his account he could not worship God properly; to make him, so far as then he could be made, a Christian. A sense, then, of sinfulness, and a necessity of atonement, was the practical habit formed by sacrifices; and so mankind were trained into a state of preparation for the Gospel and its benefits, to be communicated to them after the death of Christ, at the time of His descent into Limbo.

Besides these features which I have mentioned of an external living system, of a patriarchal Church, there is yet another, but one not so sensible, probably, to the Patriarchs themselves as it is to us: I mean the existence

of types and resemblances to the facts of the Christian dispensation. Types, we know, formed a most important element in the Mosaic dispensation. Its whole ceremonial is figurative: 'See that thou make all things according to the pattern shown thee in the Mount.' The great distinction between the types of the patriarchal dispensation and those of the Mosaic seems to be mainly this: in the latter they were *things*; in the former they consisted of historical facts, personal acts, and characters. Certain men were clothed upon with a typical resemblance to our Lord and His acts. Adam himself, St. Paul says, was the 'figure of Him that was to come.' Abraham undoubtedly has a typical character; but more especially Isaac, whose birth was announced by an angel; whose conception was by a miracle; who was named before he was conceived; who contained within himself the promise which related to the Redeemer of the world; for he stood for the time being as *the* seed in whom all nations were to be blessed. But most remarkably does his typical character appear in the commanded sacrifice of him by his father—a rehearsal, as it were, two thou-

sand years beforehand of the death of Jesus Christ, and probably on the identical spot ; for it was on a part of Mount Moriah, which we know was the name of the hill on which Jerusalem was built. That spot, too, could not have been chosen by chance, for Abraham had to make a three-days' journey to it. Isaac carries the instrument of his own sacrifice up to the mountain, Abraham the while exhibiting what no other human being (not even St. Joseph, Our Lady's husband and guardian) has been privileged to exhibit, viz. the affection of the Eternal Father Himself, and His love to His only-begotten Son—a love which did not prevent His giving up that only Son to death.

In the history of Joseph, again, we may trace almost as exact a parallel. The son of his father's love : marked out prophetically for great glory, but passing through a course of suffering and ill-treatment to reach it, in which the jealousy and bad feelings of those who were his brethren after the flesh were main agents : falsely accused, condemned and delivered over to death : raised from his state of ignominy to the right hand of power, for the benefit of

those very brethren, in order to save their souls alive in time of famine, and at length taking them to share his own honours : all these features are to us very distinct. But they could not have been so to the actors themselves, though they do seem to have been aware of a much greater importance attaching to their own acts and circumstances than could possibly attach to mere human things in general. Indeed it seems necessary to consider them as impressed with a certain mysterious sense of their relation to a Redeemer not as yet fully revealed, in order rightly to understand their conduct.

When, then, with these preliminary notions we come to the Book of Genesis, we shall be prepared for what immediately strikes us, viz. the brevity and indistinctness of those passages which, doctrinally, are the most important. In the whole period before the Deluge we have but one recorded revelation respecting man's spiritual interests, and that is the statement made to the serpent ; 'And the Lord God said to the serpent : Because thou hast done this thing thou art cursed among all cattle and beasts of the earth : upon thy breast shalt

thou go, and earth shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.”<sup>19</sup> Now that statement, by itself, is evidently quite unequal to be the sole foundation of such a living practical system of religion as existed at that time. It requires the existence of a divinely-appointed teaching Church, with its groundwork of traditional knowledge, to give it a value. The Patriarchs before the Flood could not possibly have got out of that brief statement all the knowledge of the truth which they undoubtedly had. Its value to them depended on the extent to which they followed in humility the teaching of the Divine system in which they lived. Even when we come to Abraham, who seems to have lived in the very light of God’s countenance, still the revelation recorded to have been made to him is brief and indistinct; merely, ‘in thy seed.’ There is not enough there, surely, on which to build the whole religion of Abraham. And when we pass on again to the next recorded

<sup>19</sup> Gen. iii. 14, 15.

revelation, that to Jacob respecting his relation to the Shiloh, there is the same indistinctness. What, then, is the light in which we are to regard these brief revelations in the letter of Holy Scripture? We are to look upon them as pregnant statements, presupposing a Divine teaching system; statements containing of course a great deal of meaning, but clothed and wrapped up as it were: not speaking clearly, if at all, to persons who knew nothing else but those words, yet giving sufficient knowledge to those living under a divinely-appointed teacher, and proportioning that knowledge to the completeness of that teacher's instruction; so that those very same words in which *we* see clearly the shadowing forth of a personal Redeemer, incarnate through a Virgin Mother, in consequence of our living in the 'fulness of time'—those same words, though they did not convey as much to the Patriarch, yet gave a fixity to his hopes, and made him look forward in the proper attitude of faith to the atonement of a personal Redeemer.

These doctrinal statements, then, we must look upon as a sort of undeveloped Gospel.

The Patriarch had his eyes prepared for looking at them, by the religious system in which he was trained. The Jew, too, was prepared for seeing so much more meaning in them, by the religious habits he gained in the more complete system in which he lived. The Christian alone can see clearly their entire meaning, being under the teaching of the infallible Church of Jesus Christ, that possesses the fullness of the Spirit given at Pentecost.

## LECTURE I.

### THE CREATION.

THE account of the Creation in the first chapter of Genesis presents difficulties from the circumstance of modern science having distinctly established both the great antiquity of the material of the earth, and the existence of animal life on it previous to the creation of man. These difficulties, arising from the comparison of Holy Scripture with scientific facts, are certainly very great. That they should have existed might have been expected beforehand, seeing that the Mosaic narrative must needs have been adapted to the state of mind and the popular notions of mankind in unscientific times. If Moses had adopted the language of science, his narrative would not have told its tale to the great mass of the people, who were rude and illiterate. And even the narrative in its popular form confines itself simply to the

statement of actual facts, which found their explanation in the traditional teaching of the divinely-appointed system. Certainly, of all subjects, we should expect the creation of the world to be the most mysterious, and the language of Genesis evidently intimates a mystery, and rather hides than explains the process of creation. 'There are doubtless,' says M. Nicolas, 'in these accounts (of the Creation) things incomprehensible and supernatural; but it is easy to see that this arises from their nature, and not from the imagination of the historian. It would shock our sense of propriety were there nothing supernatural in the creation of nature; for nature could not serve as a rule to herself before she existed. We can understand and judge naturally of things only according to the laws which have been established between them and ourselves, and not according to those which may exist between them and God, who alone is His own law; and our incredulity often arises from the false application we make to the Sovereign Being of laws which He has imposed on His creatures. Here incredulity would be all the more unreasonable, seeing

that the supernatural facts of Genesis relate to a period when nature and her laws were not yet established ; when, to speak truly, nothing was *natural* save the good pleasure of God. "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? tell me, if thou hast understanding" (Job xviii.). The whole of nature is sown with mysteries, and we would not forsooth find any while God yet held it in His creative hands.<sup>1</sup> The right course to take in regard to these and similar difficulties on which the Church has not authoritatively spoken, is, unquestionably, to recognise as true whatever is *demonstrated* in science by such evidence as, independent of Holy Scripture, would be overpowering ; and to hold also as true the mysterious language of Scripture on the same facts, and to wait till we can clearly reconcile the two phases of truth, either by the progress of natural science, or by the infallible decision of the Church. This indeed has ever been, and always will be, the attitude of the Church in presence of such difficulties. She, as guardian of the truth, can

<sup>1</sup> Nicolas, *Etudes philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, t. i. pp. 305, 306.

never, in a solemn definition, contradict Scripture; and the very cases which her enemies are in the habit of bringing forward in her past history, to deny this, are, in reality, but the strongest proof of it.

If we take the whole range of scientific discoveries, we shall see that they have most remarkably confirmed the truth of the Scripture narrative. Let us, then, consider what the difficulties in regard to the Creation as related in the Book of Genesis amount to. One of the surest facts about the earth is, that its present state must have required an enormous period of time for its construction. That part which can be examined by man is like a building put together course upon course. It consists of different strata, each stratum almost, with the exception of the primitive ones, containing within itself traces of vegetable or animal existence, which must have been contemporary with its formation; the different orders of animal or vegetable life in the different strata being distinct, or nearly so, so as to indicate that while the ancient strata were in course of formation, a different order of animals or vegetation existed

.

from that which existed at a later period. The forms of life become more and more distinct as the work of formation goes on. So that in the periods which come near to the creation of mankind, large quadrupeds existed of similar character to those which are man's companions, though not identical with them in species. The formation of any one of these strata must have required an enormous time. For instance, there are large beds, which were formed by deposits in water, and formed slowly, because the deposits lie in level layers, or nearly so; and in those layers there are remains of vegetation, which must have had time to grow. There are remains, too, in the hard coal-measures of insect formation which required time to develop. And this being the case with nearly every layer throughout the stratum, it is clear that a very long period would be required to account for its structure—perhaps millions of years.

The scientific view resulting from these geological facts is, that the original state of the earth was a liquid mass of matter; that as it cooled down, a crust formed upon its surface; that this crust was broken up by explosions

from beneath, as would naturally be the case in the cooling of a globe of igneous matter ; that the different gases, escaping and mixing with the deposit of vapour that surrounded it, caused other strata to be formed upon the original crust ; and that as these changes went on, new forms of vegetation and animal life were created, suited to the contemporaneous state of the material structure ; the earliest strata having the simplest forms of life, and creation going on towards the present system, approximating to it according as the state of the surface was adapted thereto.

Now with that view of the results of natural science, let us see what Holy Scripture says on the point.

In the first place, it seems distinctly to recognise the existence of the material of the earth at a very ancient time : ‘In the beginning God created heaven and earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was on the face of the deep.’<sup>2</sup> And then in the following verses the work of creation is detailed. It is not said that the earth itself was created in

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 1, 2.

one of those six days, but that '*in the beginning* God created heaven and earth:' in the beginning, that is, of time; time being simply the duration of a created thing. Before those two first verses of Genesis there was no *time*: time began with the creation of the first contingent thing, the material of the heaven and the earth. 'By these words,' says the Abbé Guillois, "'in the beginning," we must understand an indefinite period which preceded, perhaps by a great number of ages, that in which the earth, created at the beginning of all things, received a new form and arrangement. *At the beginning*, not of the first day, as certain commentators have it, but of time.'<sup>3</sup>

This is the explanation, too, given by St. Augustine: 'Heaven and earth,' he says, 'are here called *materia prima*, from the fact that from it heaven on the second day, and the earth on the third day, were to be produced';<sup>4</sup> and again: 'That rude matter which God made out of nothing was called at first heaven and

<sup>3</sup> *Explication historique, dogmatique, morale, liturgique et canonique du Catéchisme*, par l'Abbé Ambroise Guillois, t. i. p. 103.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. i. *De Gen. contra Manich.* c. vii.

earth, not because these already existed, but because they *could* be: for heaven and earth are described as being made afterwards, just as if, in considering the seed of a tree, we should say that the roots are there, and the trunk and the leaves and fruit and branches, not that they already exist, but because from thence they will spring.<sup>5</sup> By *heaven*, then, is meant the *materia prima*, out of which God on the second day made the highest heaven, the empyrean, which St. Paul calls the heaven of heavens, the abode of the Blessed. And this is the opinion of St. Bede, and St. Basil, quoted by Cornelius a Lapide, and St. Thomas. The creation, then, detailed in the first chapter of Genesis, beginning with the creation, so called, of light, is the bringing order out of confusion, and the peopling of a world which was before unpeopled.

There are two ways suggested of reconciling this account with scientific facts. The one, that the Mosaic creation is that stage of creation only which immediately preceded the present order: that, previous to the time referred to in the Mosaic account, vegetable and animal life

<sup>5</sup> Lib. i. *De Gen. ad lit.* c. xiv.

had existed, but been destroyed: that there was a state of darkness and confusion, out of which order had to be brought, a state of barrenness and dearth of life, a void to be filled up with new life, when man, the highest of God's works, was to be placed there. We should *then* see in the Mosaic account simply the last preparation of the earth's surface for man, and the creation of those plants and animals which were meant to be his companions. If we adopt this method of reconciling Holy Scripture with scientific facts, then when we meet with fossil remains not referable to existing genera, we should say that they were not comprehended in the creation which Moses recorded in detail, but were previous to it: Moses not speaking of them, as they had nothing to do with man. That, I say, is one method, and till within the last twenty-five years the one generally adopted. The other method, which is far the more satisfactory, since it takes cognisance of all the results of modern research and discovery in the physical sciences, is to take the Mosaic account as applying to the whole history of life on the earth's surface, but to understand the terms

'morning' and 'evening' as including long periods of time, such as under that hypothesis would be absolutely necessary. This theory is held by most Christian scientific men of the present day, who consider it the only one capable of meeting the attacks of Infidelity and Rationalism. And we must remember, too, that the Church, always so jealous of the sacred deposit committed to her, has not only not condemned it, but has allowed it to be publicly taught in her universities, and even at Rome.<sup>6</sup> And if we ask why the Church has allowed this full liberty of discussion, St. Thomas, following St. Augustine, will furnish a reply: 'In matters which pertain to the faith,' says the saint, 'we must make a twofold distinction. For there are certain things which in themselves belong to the substance of the faith, such as, that God is Three, and One, and the like, in which no one is allowed to think differently: and some things there are which belong only accidentally

<sup>6</sup> Vide Bossuet, in his *Elevatio V. in Mysteria*; Rohrbacher, in the discourse delivered on his appointment to the membership of the Royal Scientific Society of Nancy; Schnappinger, in his *Doctrina Dogmatica Ecclesiae*; Jassens, *Herm. Sac.* vol. i.; Liebermann, *Inst. Theol.* vol. i.; and Perrone, *ad loc.*

(to the faith), inasmuch, that is, as they are found in Scripture, which faith supposes to have been promulgated at the dictation of the Holy Spirit; and these indeed may without danger be unknown to those who are not obliged to know Scripture, such, for instance, as many points of history: and even on these points the saints have differed, giving various explanations of the divine Scripture. Thus, with regard to the origin of the world, there is something which belongs to the substance of faith, viz. that the world came into being by the creative act of God, and in this all the saints agree: but as to the particular mode and order in which it was made, this belongs but accidentally to the faith, inasmuch as it is contained in Scripture, keeping to the truth of which the saints have given various interpretations.<sup>7</sup>

This periodic theory, then, so to call it, has the support of all modern scientific men. It is quite certain now, from late researches in geo-

<sup>7</sup> 'Quæ ad fidem pertinent dupliciter distinguuntur: quædam enim sunt per se de substantia fidei, ut Deum esse Trinum et unum, et hujusmodi, in quibus nulli licet aliter opinari: quædam vero per accidens tantum, in quantum scilicet in Scriptura traduntur, quam fides supponit Spiritu Sancto dictante promulgatam esse, quæ quidem ignorari

logy, that the former theory of alternative creations and destructions on the earth's surface is untenable. The different successive beds of fossils of similar species are by no means regular; they overlap one another, and we find certain of the ancient species continuing on amid the later ones: so that a general destruction there could not have been. The sacred historian, too, seems to be in entire agreement with this fact. He speaks of the creation of each genus or species of vegetables, fishes, reptiles, terrestrial animals, and then of man; and the expression, '*Et vidit Deus quod erat bonum,*' which comes at the conclusion of each order of creation, excludes the hypothesis of successive creations on the ruins of previous ones. There is, however, a perfectly distinct general order of organised beings, which shows us clearly

---

sine periculo possunt ab his qui Scripturam scire non tenentur, sicut multa historialia, et in his etiam Sancti diverse senserunt, Scripturam divinam diversimode exponentes. Sic ergo circa mundi principium aliquid est, quod ad substantiam fidei pertinet, scilicet, mundum incoepisse creatum a Deo, et hoc omnes Sancti concorditer dicunt: quo autem modo et ordine factus sit non pertinet ad fidem nisi per accidens, in quantum in Scriptura traditur, cujus veritatem diversa expositione Sancti servantes diversa tradiderunt.'  
—In 2dm sent. dist. xii. a. 2.

that they were created *once*, in accordance with this order, and in conformity with the cosmogony of Moses. M. Barraude, quoted by M. Nicolas, gives the following key to the science of geology, and we find the sacred historian in wonderful harmony with it :

<i>Quaternary or Historic Strata.</i>		
<i>Tertiary</i>	Post-pliocene, alluvium . . . . .	Period of man.
	Pliocene, diluvium . . . . .	Bony caverns, erratic blocks.
	Miocene . . . . .	Terrestrial mammals.
	Eocene . . . . .	Marine mammals. Skeletons of birds.
<i>Secondary</i>	Chalk . . . . .	No terrestrial animal.
	Oolite . . . . .	Abundance of large marine reptiles.
	Lias . . . . .	Marine reptiles.
	Trias, new red sandstone . . . . .	Traces of birds, and bones of birds, recently discovered.
<i>Primary</i>	Parmian . . . . .	Fishes.
	Carboniferous . . . . .	Insects. Considerable terrestrial vegetation.
	Devonian, old red sandstone . . . . .	Oldest fishes.
	Silurian . . . . .	Terrestrial plants of the moss family; rare molluscs; trilobites in large numbers.
	Cambrian, the oldest fossil beds . . . . .	Marine vegetables.
<i>Primitive Strata</i> . . . . .		Inanimate nature, purely mineral.

In the above table we find the exact order of the Mosaic cosmogony, first vegetable life, then animal life in progressive order, fishes, insects, reptiles, birds, quadrupeds.

We may easily convince ourselves of this, by a careful comparison of the words of the sacred historian with the established facts of geology: 'And God called the dry land earth: and the gathering together of the waters he called seas. And God saw that it was good. And He said, Let the earth bring forth the green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after its kind, which may have seed in itself upon the earth. And the earth brought forth the green herb, and such as yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that beareth fruit, having seed each according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.'

We have here a statement by Moses, that the vegetable kingdom was first in the order of creation of living things: the work of the third day. And, moreover, he uses three different words to express the gradation of vegetable life, *שֶׁמֶץ* *germen*, *יֵשֶׁבֶת* *herba*, *עֵץ* *arbor*; the first indi-

ating the simplest form of vegetable life, *the cellular plants*; the second, the more complicated organisations known generally by the name of *herbs*; and the third, *trees*. The cellular plants are the first germs of marine vegetation. The sacred historian does not, it is true, make specific mention of the creation of this primary vegetation. He speaks of one single creation of the vegetable kingdom. But the three words he employs, implying a specific distinction, clearly point to it. 'Moses relates simply the grand facts of the creation. He mentions the successive appearance of plants, fish, reptiles, birds, and mammals. All the small creatures of an inferior order, that teemed in the bosom of the primitive seas, disappeared in the narrative of the inspired author; for in the eyes of the people to whom Moses addressed his words these creatures were of no importance. It is only within the last few centuries, more particularly in our own age, that men have begun to make a methodical and serious study of these creatures. Moses could not and should not have concerned himself about them. We must not feel surprise that no word of Ge-

nesis leads us to suspect their existence. The one object Moses had in view was, to show us the particular class of beings that predominated at the various periods, and which, from its special importance and usefulness to man, would attract his attention. Now the culminating fact of the third period, from this standpoint, is the appearance of plants. Because the inspired author tells us that God commanded the earth to bring forth plants, herbs, and trees of every species, he does not exclude the creation of these inferior beings at the bottom of the seas. It seems reasonable that God, in adorning the earth with an immense carpet of verdure, should also have peopled the seas with beings whose organisation harmonised perfectly with the high temperature of the waters. The earth and the sea were created the same day, and fixed at the same time in their specific conditions.<sup>8</sup>

According to the Mosaic account, then, we have, first, the creation of marine vegetation, then that of the terrestrial, herbs and trees; and in looking at the table above given, we shall

<sup>8</sup> *Le Monde et l'Homme primitif*, par Mgr. Meignan, p. 62.

see that this corresponds exactly with the discoveries of geologists. In the oldest fossil beds, the Cambrian, we find marine vegetation, and in those immediately above, viz. the Silurian, we have the earliest terrestrial vegetation, plants of the moss family, with a certain number of molluscs and trilobites; and in the carboniferous strata there is found a very considerable terrestrial vegetation.

As it was God's will to act through secondary causes in the long preparation of the earth's surface for the convenience of man, we can see clearly the reason why the vegetable kingdom was the first to make its appearance. 'God having created the world,' says M. Gaudichaud, 'it was His will to fertilise it, and He scattered numberless germs of vegetables and animals that should people the land and the waters, from the highest mountain-peaks to the greatest depths of the sea. All the greatest minds of ancient and modern times agree in maintaining that vegetables preceded animals, and that the earth was covered with the former before the appearance of the latter. Theology, moreover, has handed down to us this fact, from age

to age, in the history of the seven periods, or divine days of creation. The philosophers of our own day, by proving, some that man has left no traces in the more ancient strata, and others that the simplest vegetables preceded the more complicated in organisation, have now given the sanction of science to the great creative epoques of the first age. Each century brings its progress, and every progress of the human mind is a new proof in favour of eternal truth.”<sup>9</sup>

‘The result of the ingenious experiments of M. Adolphe Bugniart,’ says M. Ampère, ‘seems to be, that quite in ancient times the atmosphere contained much more carbonic acid than it does now. It was unfit for animals to breathe, but most favourable for vegetation; and the earth was covered with plants which found in the air, then more rich in carbon, a more abundant nourishment than now exists; the result of which was a more considerable development, which was, moreover, increased by a higher degree of temperature. In this

<sup>9</sup> *Comptes rendus de l'Académie*, 1842, t. i. p. 94, quoted by Mgr. Meignan.

way is explained the priority in creation of the vegetables over that of the animals, and the gigantic height of the former.<sup>10</sup>

Again, M. Marcel de Serres, writing on the same subject, says: 'According to Moses, as well as according to facts, vegetables were the first beings that adorned the earth, once emerged. . . . Plants necessarily made their appearance before the animals; for, according to M. Dumas (chemical statistics of organised bodies), animals receive from vegetables the aliments necessary for their support. On the other hand, the former give back to the vegetable kingdom, by means of the air and soil, those principles, by means of which they develop with a vigour all the greater in proportion to the activity of their assimilating powers.'<sup>11</sup>

The work of the fifth day is thus described by the sacred historian: 'God also said, Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven. And God

<sup>10</sup> M. Ampère, *Théorie de la Terre*, quoted by Mgr. Meignan.

<sup>11</sup> Mgr. Meignan, *Le Monde et l'Homme primitif*, p. 66.

created the great whales, and every living and moving creature which the waters brought forth, according to their kinds, and every winged fowl according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.'

The first meaning which Gesenius gives to the word *תנין* is 'water-serpent,' and it is applicable both to fishes and reptiles. Then we have the creation of birds; but as yet no land animal. These facts, again, correspond exactly with the independent discoveries of the geologist. 'Immediately after the vegetable kingdom,' says M. Nicolas, 'which is the first above inanimate nature, and which is signalised by fucoids, the molluscs and trilobites were created; then fishes. There cannot be the slightest doubt about this; and it corresponds literally with the text of Moses, "the creeping creature having life." Moreover, the expression *omne volatile* refers still to the reptilian class, as well as to birds properly so called.' 'The second age of the geologist,' says Mr. Hugh Miller, 'possessed, like the earlier one, its herbs and plants, but they were of a greatly less luxuriant and conspicuous character than their prede-

cessors, and no longer formed the prominent trait or feature of the creation to which they belonged. The period had also its corals, its crustaceans, its molluscs, its fishes, and, in some one or two exceptional instances, its dwarf mammals. But the grand existences of the age—the existences in which it excelled every other creation, earlier or later—were its huge creeping things, its enormous monsters of the deep, and, as shown by the impressions of their footprints stamped upon the rocks, its gigantic birds. It was peculiarly the age of egg-bearing animals, winged and wingless. Its wonderful *whales*, not however, as now, of the mammalian, but of the reptilian class—ichthyosaurs, plesiosaurs, and cetiosaurs—must have tempested the deep: its creeping lizards and crocodiles, such as the teliosaurus, megalosaurus, and iguanodon—creatures some of which more than rivalled the existing elephant in height, and greatly more than rivalled him in bulk—must have crowded the plains, or haunted by myriads the rivers of the period; and we know that the footprints of at least one of its many birds, are fully twice the size of those made by the

horse or camel. We are thus fully prepared to demonstrate that the second period of the geologist was peculiarly and characteristically a period of whale-like reptiles of the sea, of enormous creeping reptiles of the land, and of numerous birds, some of them of gigantic size.<sup>13</sup>

Of the work of the sixth day, we read in Genesis as follows: 'And God said: Let the earth bring forth the living creature in its kind, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, according to their kinds. And it was so done. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds, and cattle, and every thing that creepeth on the earth after its kind. And God saw that it was good.'

Here again geologists, by their independent testimony, will confirm the truth of the Scripture narrative. 'The Tertiary period,' says again Hugh Miller, 'had also its prominent class of existences. Its flora seems to have been no more conspicuous than that of the present time: its reptiles occupy a very subordinate place: but its beasts of the field were by far the most wonderfully developed, both in

<sup>13</sup> *Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 126.

size and numbers, that ever appeared on the earth. Its mammoths and its mastodons, its rhinoceri and its hippopotami, its enormous deintherium and colossal megatherium, greatly more than equalled in bulk the greatest mammals of the present time, and vastly exceeded them in number. . . . Truly this Tertiary age—this third and last of the geologic periods—was peculiarly the age of great beasts of the earth after their kind, and of cattle after their kind.’<sup>13</sup>

Dr. Molloy, in his most interesting book, *Geology and Revelation*,<sup>14</sup> thus sums up his comparison of the Scriptural account of the creation of vegetable and animal life on the earth with that of geologists: ‘Three days are specially marked out by the inspired historian, as distinguished by the creation of vegetable and animal life—the third, the fifth, and the sixth. On the third day were created plants and trees; on the fifth, reptiles, fish, and birds; on the sixth, cattle and the beasts of the earth, and, towards the end, man himself.

<sup>13</sup> *Testimony of the Rocks*, pp. 127, 128.

<sup>14</sup> p. 416.

‘Geologists, on the other hand, not influenced in the least degree by the Scripture narrative, but guided chiefly by the remains of animal and vegetable life that are preserved in the crust of the earth, have established three leading divisions of geological time : the Palæozoic, or first great age of organic life ; the Mesozoic, or second great age of organic life ; and the Kainozoic, or third great age of organic life. Here, no doubt, is a remarkable coincidence. But it would be still more remarkable if we could recognise, in the three epochs of geology, the same general characteristics of organic life as we find ascribed by Moses to the three successive days of the Bible narrative. And so we may, it is said, if we will only take the pains to examine for ourselves the organic remains of these geological epochs, as they lie dispersed through the crust of the earth, or even as they are to be found collected and arranged for exhibition in our museums. The first great age of geology is eminently distinguished for its plants and trees ; the second, for its huge reptiles and great sea monsters ; the third, for its vast herds of noble quadrupeds.

Nay, to complete the harmony between the two records, as man is represented by the inspired writer to have been created towards the close of the last day, so, towards the close of the last geological age, the remains of man and of his works are found, for the first time, laid by in the archives of the earth.'

The theory, then, of the six *days* of creation being six periods of indefinite length would seem to be the only one which harmonises the Scripture narrative with geological facts.

Against this periodic theory of creation, however, we have the difficulty put forward of the six days of creation being days of twenty-four hours each. I think, however, it is but a difficulty, and easily met. To put it as strongly as possible, it is this: the periodic theory, though it may be consistent with scientific facts, seems quite at variance with the words of Moses, 'morning and evening one day,' and God's own words in giving the Ten Commandments. The words of the third Commandment are: 'Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy works. But on the

seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no work in it, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested the seventh day: therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.' Now the first time that the word 'day' is mentioned here, it unquestionably is intended to convey the sense of twenty-four hours, 'the Sabbath day.' Immediately afterwards we have 'six days shalt thou labour,' &c., which equally refers to periods of twenty-four hours each. Again, 'the seventh day is the Sabbath,' &c. Then we come to the passage which refers to the creation detailed in Genesis: 'for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth.'

Now to suppose that the six days here last mentioned should be six enormously long periods of time, when the word *day* both before and after, in the same connection, means evidently twenty-four hours, is to do violence to language. It was precisely because Almighty

God had chosen to employ six *days*, six periods of twenty-four hours, for the work of creation, and then rested on the seventh *day*, or period of twenty-four hours, that He exacted of the Jews a rest or Sabbath of equal duration. The six *days*, then, are six periods of twenty-four hours each.

Such is the difficulty against the periodic theory of creation. How is it met? In the first place, we know that the word *day* (*iom*) is frequently used in Scripture generally in the sense of *period*. For instance: Gen. ii. 17; Exod. x. 18, xxxii. 34; Isa. xi. 16; Lam. iii. 57; and more especially Gen. ii. 4: 'These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created, in the *day* that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth.' Moreover, our Lord Himself uses the word *day* in this sense: 'Abraham your Father rejoiced to see My *day*; he saw it and was glad.' But if such is the sense that we are allowed to give to the word 'day,' in the language of Scripture generally, how much more reasonable is it to give it that sense when it is a question of an epoch anterior to all human chronology, and

which can only be understood in a Divine and supernatural manner! Here especially the word 'day' must have an indefinite sense, as being not the *day* of man, but the *day* of God, with whom, as St. Peter says, 'one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.'

The Bible itself seems to distinguish between these *days* of creation and ordinary days. The Jewish day was reckoned from evening to evening. The first *day* of creation, on the contrary, begins with light; then follows evening, then morning, forming one day. The first day therefore ended with the aurora of the second. We can see this by looking at the Hebrew: *וַיְהיֶה עֶרְבַּי וַיְהיֶה קֶדֶם*, 'and there was evening, and there was dawn, one day' (Gen. i. 5). If the first day had begun with the evening, the Bible would not call a *day* the time when God created the light: the first day would be the second of the Mosaic narrative. The *days* of creation therefore can hardly be the ordinary *days* of the Hebrews; and if not ordinary days, they must have been periods of indefinite length. The Mosaic days were mea-

sured by the indefinite duration of the light, and by the darkness which followed. The solar days were the measure of time only *after* the creation.<sup>15</sup>

M. Nicolas, from whom I have taken the above table, goes even farther. 'We *must* understand,' he says,<sup>16</sup> 'the word (day) in this sense; and it would destroy the sacred text and the sense of Genesis to understand by it an ordinary day. It will be conceded to me, first of all, without difficulty, that the word *day* has the same sense for the six days of the creation, and that the first, second, or third days are not different sorts of days—in a word, that these days are similar, since the terms which Moses makes use of are identical. So much is clear. Now it was only on the fourth day that the luminaries were formed, in order that they might "divide the day and the night," and "be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years." The three preceding days were not days that had their morning and evening, their

<sup>15</sup> See Mgr. Meignan, *Le Monde et l'Homme primitif*, c. i.

<sup>16</sup> *Etude phil. sur le Christianisme*, t. i. l. ii. p. 371.

separation of day and night, since the luminaries which make these divisions did not yet exist. It is impossible for these three first days to understand literally the words, "and there was morning and there was evening, one day." How, then, are we to understand them, unless as meaning "and of the beginning and the end was composed the first epoch," or, as Moses says, the first "generation." But if we are obliged so to understand the first three days, we can hardly escape the conclusion that we must so understand the other three; and that the six days being, as we have seen, similar, are not six days, but six epochs of undetermined duration.' M. Nicolas then quotes St. Augustine, St. Athanasius, Origen, St. Thomas of Aquin, and Bossuet as favouring this interpretation.

'According to the narrative of Moses,' says M. Orin, 'each of the six days lasted "from the evening to the morning." Now it is not mentioned that the seventh day ended at the morning of another; and this seventh day still lasts, according to the belief of the Fathers of the Church; it has lasted for nearly six thousand

years, and will only end from the evening (of time) to the morning (of eternity): or rather it will never end, but become one with the eternal day, when the Catholic Church, eternal like her Author, after having traversed the ages, shall return with us into that eternity whence she sprang. How, then, knowing that the first, second, third, and seventh days of Genesis were not considered by the author of Genesis as ordinary days—how can any one dare to maintain that he did consider as such the fourth, fifth, and sixth days?<sup>17</sup>

As to the seventh day, of which we do not read that it had a 'morning' and 'evening,' M. Nicolas says: 'The repose of the Creator on the seventh day has furnished a source of railery and sarcasm against Moses. Yet what is needed to restore to him his sublimity and depth? Simply to read the passage in question, but to read it with that meditative attention which is the daughter of respect. "And God rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. And He blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He

<sup>17</sup> *La Foi vengée*, par J. M. Orin, Paris, p. 36.

had rested from all His work which God created and made" (Gen. ii. 2, 3). For this seventh day, the historian changes his language. He no longer says, as he did for the others, "And the evening and the morning were the . . . day." This remarkable exception must have some cause, in a Book in which, as we have already seen, each word has so much importance and truth. What is this cause? The only one which suggests itself naturally to the mind is that this day still lasts, still continues, and shines yet over our heads; that it is, in fact, simply the natural and historic *period* to which we belong; and this agrees exactly with the interpretation we have just given of the word "day." God rested; that is, as Moses says, that on this day He ceased to bring forth all the works He had created; that after having made nature to pass through six successive labours, which brought it to the time when man took possession of it, He stopped the whole series. He blessed it, and sanctified it, and stamped it with that solemn regularity, that invariable harmony even in its variety, that calm, that order, that profound repose, which

has marked its course for six thousand years, and which is the image of the unutterable peace and repose which reign in the bosom of its Author.'

The above explanation is very beautiful and satisfactory so far as it goes; but it does not touch the real difficulty contained in the view which makes the six days of creation to be six natural days: viz. the *reason* for God's instituting the Jewish Sabbath. 'God appointed six days for work'—say the upholders of that view—'and one day of twenty-four hours as a rest from work, because He had worked six days of twenty-four hours, and rested on the seventh; and the wording of the third Commandment obliges us to understand the "days" there spoken as six natural days, unless we do violence to language. Work on six days, for in six days God created the heaven and the earth. Rest on the seventh day, for God rested on the seventh day.'

That is putting the difficulty as strongly, I suppose, as it is possible to put it. And yet I must confess that it has but little weight with me.

To begin with, geological *facts* as to the succession of organised beings on the earth's surface favour the interpretation of the *six days* as being six indefinitely long *periods*. And the reason given for instituting the Sabbath seems to be quite as urgent from this standpoint as from the other of six natural days. God's acts and man's must necessarily have their relative proportion, and that proportion is observed in the present case by supposing man to work during *his* six periods and to rest on *his* seventh, whatever be the length of the period, analogously to the way in which God worked in *His* six periods and rested on *His* seventh.

Mr. Hugh Miller puts this well: 'It has been urged that this scheme of periods is irreconcilable with that Divine "reason" for the institution of the Sabbath, which He who appointed the day of old has in His goodness vouchsafed to man. I have failed to see any force in this objection. God the Creator, who wrought during six periods, rested during the seventh period; and as we have no evidence whatever that He recommenced His work of creation—as, on the contrary, man seems to be

the last formed of creatures—God may be resting still. The presumption is, that His Sabbath is an extended period, not a natural day ; . . and so I cannot see that it in the least interferes with the integrity of the reason rendered to read it as follows: Work during six periods and rest on the seventh ; for in six periods the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh period He rested. The Divine periods may have been very great—the human periods very small. But if in the map or globe the proportions be faithfully maintained, and the scale, though a minute one, be true in all its parts and applications, we pronounce the map or globe, notwithstanding the smallness of the size, a faithful copy. Were man's Sabbaths to be kept as enjoined, and in the Divine proportions, it would scarcely interfere with the logic of the "reason annexed to the fourth [our third] Commandment;" though in this matter, as in all others in which man can be an imitator of God, the imitation should be a miniature one.<sup>18</sup>

We now come to what used to be considered

<sup>18</sup> *Testimony of the Rocks* by Hugh Miller, p. 152.

a great difficulty, the greatest, in fact, to be met with, in the attempt to reconcile the Mosaic narrative with scientific facts. It is with regard to the creation of light and the subsequent statement of the creation of the sources of light, the sun, moon, and heavenly bodies. The existence of light without a luminous body as its source was, in the natural order, inconceivable to men of science; that is, they could not reconcile it with what they knew of the nature of light; for light in a dispersed state, without a source, was an idea altogether foreign to facts about the nature of light within their knowledge. They could not, then, understand MOSES to mean that first light was created, and then at a subsequent period the luminaries. One way out of the difficulty they thought was to understand (as the Hebrew word will allow us to do) the appointment of the lights in the firmament of heaven as an *institution*, an ordinance of God, rather than an act of creation; for the word in the sixteenth verse for 'made' is not *עָשָׂה*, which is the usual word to express creation proper, as in the first verse of the first chapter, but *וַיִּבְרָא*, the primary idea

of which is 'shaping, forming,' and might well be rendered here 'appointed.' Catharinus, quoted by Cornelius a Lapide *ad loc.*, says that the light of the first day was really the light of the sun; and this also is the opinion of St. Thomas, who adds, that though it was the sun, it was in an imperfect state.<sup>19</sup> According to this view, then, the light spoken of on the first day was not, strictly speaking, *created*. God created all *materia prima* 'in the beginning' of time, prior, that is, to the present order, and from that *materia* He brought forth this light, *למאור*, and all other essential and accidental forms. This, however, is not quite satisfactory.

The Abbé Ambroise Guillois, in his *Explanation of the Catechism*, has some remarks on this point, which are quite worth quoting

<sup>19</sup> 'Et ideo est dicendum, quod, ut Dionysius dicit, 4. c. de div. nom. p. i. l. 3, illa lux fuit lux solis, sed adhuc informis quantum ad hoc, quod jam erat substantia solis, et habebat virtutem illuminativam in communi: sed postmodum data est ei specialis et determinata virtus ad particulares effectus.' *Sum. i. p. q. 67, a. 4, ad 2m.*

And again: 'Ad quartam dicendum, quod prima die facta est natura lucis in aliquo subjecto, sed quarta die facta dicuntur luminaria: non quia eorum substantia sit de novo producta, sed quia sunt aliquo modo formata quo prius non erant.' *Ib. i. p. q. 74, a. 1.*

here; for they are based on the modern researches of science. 'The first remarkable operation,' he says, 'of the Eternal on the matter created by Him consisted in converting an immense portion into luminous matter, and separating this luminous matter from that which was not so. "Let there be light, and there was light." This operation of the Creator was not a creation properly so called, but a simple production, since it was exercised on matter already existing; but it is none the less the visible effect of an infinite intelligence and power. . . . The creation, or rather the formation of light previous to that of the sun, has been considered by unbelievers as an absurdity quite sufficient to convict Moses of an imposture. This objection, however, is simply without any value whatever. The most celebrated physicists allow, and consider as certain, that the luminous substance exists quite independent of luminous bodies, just as the air, the medium of sound, has an existence independent of sonorous bodies. This luminous substance is a particular kind of fluid called ether, which is scattered throughout the whole of the space

1

in the midst of which all bodies are plunged ; which penetrates even the substance of bodies. When this ether is put into vibration, there results a series of undulations in its substance, which produces the phenomenon of light. Recent experiments made by MM. Young, Arago, Fresnel, confirm this view. So that Scripture has anticipated the discoveries of the learned, and these discoveries are supported by an account (that of the Holy Scriptures) which a false philosophy has not blushed to hold forth as opposed to all our knowledge of physics. Even before the experiments and discoveries above mentioned, it was easy to see that the luminous fluid called ether did not emanate from the sun ; the sharp striking of a flint scattering sparks, the very fire on our hearths, being an evident proof of this.<sup>20</sup> St. Basil, quoted by Cornelius a Lapide *ad loc.*, inclines to think that this light was not the sun, but the quality of light without a subject : and this no doubt was quite possible to the infinite power of God ; in the same way that the accidents of Bread in the Blessed Eucharist re-

<sup>20</sup> *Explic. historique &c. du Catéchisme*, p. 106.

main without a subject proper to them. In both cases it is God who is acting.

The most satisfactory explanation of the so-called creation of light on the first day or period, and then the creation of the luminaries on the *fourth*, seems to be this: God 'in the beginning' created all *materia prima*, and therefore that of the sun, moon, and other heavenly bodies. He created also the substance of ether, or the ethereal medium, as it is called, without imparting to it any vibration. All physicists admit the existence of this substance, ether. One quotation will suffice for our purpose. Mary Somerville, in her very remarkable book, *The Connection of the Physical Sciences*, speaking of the propagation of light, says: 'It is supposed that the particles of luminous bodies are in a state of perpetual agitation, and that they possess the property of exciting regular vibrations in the ethereal medium, corresponding to the vibrations of their own molecules: and that, on account of its elastic nature, one particle of the ether, when set in motion, communicates its vibrations to those adjacent, which in succession transmit them to those

farther off: so that the primitive impulse is transferred from particle to particle, and the undulating motion darts through ether like a wave in water. . . . An analogous motion in the ether, when communicated to the optic nerves, would produce the sensation of common light.<sup>21</sup>

This substance of ether, then, the medium of light, was created by God 'in the beginning.' But He did not impart to it vibration. But when God said *וַיֵּרָא*, a vibratory motion was given to this ether, not by the sun, which as yet was not in a state to act as a motive power, but either immediately by the command of God, or because at His command the chemical elements, beginning to combine with great activity, acted as a motive body; thence arose a very high temperature, and with it light burst forth. This opinion, which is so conformable to the present state of the physical sciences, St. Gregory of Nyssa<sup>22</sup> seems to have anticipated; for he considers that that primæval light was a fire, which, by command of God, burst forth

<sup>21</sup> *Connection of the Physical Sciences*, p. 190.

<sup>22</sup> See Cornelius a Lap. *ad loc.*

from the chaotic mass and illumined all things with its light. St. John Damascene and Severianus Gabalitanus hold this same view, which, moreover, quite accords with Hebrew philology; for it is well known that the word *אֵשׁ* may signify both *fire* and *light*. Then on the fourth day, the sun, moon, and heavenly bodies were fashioned, and 'appointed' by God as the motive powers, causing the vibration of the particles of ether, and so permanently producing light, presiding over the day and over the night. There might have been on that first day such a state of the atmosphere as to prevent the action of the heavenly bodies until a certain period; and the fashioning of the *materia prima* of the sun, and the changes in the atmosphere on the surface of the earth, which would give it the benefit of such action, might be what was meant as the work of the fourth day.

M. Nicolas, in his work quoted above, puts forward this explanation, adding that not only is it no real difficulty that the light should be stated in Genesis as having burst forth before the luminaries were fashioned, but that it must necessarily have been so. 'Who does not know,'

he says, 'that each particle of matter contains a certain quantity of light, heat, and electricity, which is proper to it and quite independent of the solar rays; and therefore that Moses was right in distinguishing the primitive light from that which, later on, emanating from the sun, is now the main source of that which the earth receives?' The result of the researches of Young, Fresnel, and Arago is this: that light is brought into action by the vibration of a fluid filling the universe; an extremely subtle fluid, which fills space, which penetrates the interior of all bodies, and to which has been given the name of ether. So long as it is in repose, there is complete darkness; but when it is put in vibration, light is produced, and we have the sensation of it. This vibration may be produced by various causes, such as the sun or the stars, electricity, combustion, or even any chemical action. Moreover, in the absence of the sun, and at such a depth that it is impossible to suppose the action of its rays there, light shows itself, and bursts forth in a thousand various ways. The more we descend towards the centre of the earth, the more the sensation of heat an-

nounces the existence of this fluid, and makes us suppose that the temperature and primitive light which the earth had in the first ages of its formation were sufficiently considerable for it to do without that which the sun now sends to it. It was only when, in consequence of radiation, that this excess was scattered through the heavenly spaces, that the sun received a luminous atmosphere to compensate the earth for the light and heat its surface had lost as a result of its consolidation. So that, according to the most positive results of the physical sciences, not only light properly so called *could have*, but *ought to have* preceded the sun, which is but one of its principal motive powers.<sup>23</sup> Observe, too, that the Bible does not call the sun *light*, but the instrument of light, not ~~was~~, but ~~was~~. Speaking of this point, Mgr. Meignan says: 'We do not wish to insist unnecessarily on the exactness of biblical language; but it is impossible to imagine a word more in harmony with the modern theories with regard to light.'<sup>24</sup>

Father Pianciani takes this view. After stat-

<sup>23</sup> Nicolas, *Etudes philos. sur le Christianisme*, vol. i. p. 844.

<sup>24</sup> *Le Monde et l'Homme primitif*, p. 45.

ing that ether, the medium of light, was created, together with the heaven and the earth, in the beginning, the learned Jesuit continues: 'We may easily, as it seems to me, understand what this light was by a consideration of the laws imposed by God on nature. It was necessary that the elementary molecules, obeying the law of universal gravity, should approach each other, and that those, preordained by the Creator for the fashioning of our earth, should, so brought together, constitute this globe. Therefore, after these molecules, everywhere meeting together, had sufficiently approached each other, there necessarily arose chemical combinations, according to chemical laws. Thus from the simple or elementary molecules mixed molecules arose, and among these was generated a great force of aqueous vapour; and, not to have recourse to useless hypotheses, we may conceive that the first combinations were those which least require an elevated temperature, and are affected by the ordinary heat of the earth even in winter. Thus iron when highly heated is combined with oxygen, accompanied by the emission of luminous caloric; for iron really burns when ex-

posed to the atmospheric air. So with the metals called nickel and cobalt. In an ordinary temperature, too, are combined, with the emission of fire, chloride with antimony and with certain other metals, and iodine with phosphorus. These, and others of a like nature, generated a certain light, and at the same time raised the temperature; hence new combinations must have arisen, and both light and heat gradually have increased. Among these new combinations, and as the chief one, we must place the synthesis of water, which develops a great force of luminous caloric. And as there was present a vast quantity of the elements of which water is composed (namely, oxygen and hydrogen), light and heat must have immensely increased, and thence new affinities have been developed. Together with water, or from the caloric evolved by the origin of water, may have been produced what are called the fixed alkalis and earths, such as potassium, soda, chalk, magnesium, aluminium, flint, &c. and acids, as, for example, carbonic acid, sulphuric acid, phosphoric acid, &c. &c. From these new combinations arose greater increase of caloric and light. In the mean time

these syntheses and combustions, together with light and heat, of which they were at once the effects and the causes, were diffused through space. Much more might be added, but it is hardly necessary; for perhaps even thus much may seem to some superfluous. Imagine now some spectator to take his stand in space, and fix his eyes on the recently-formed earth. What will he see? At first, indeed, nothing; for there is darkness over the face of the abyss. But after a certain time he will see light; at first, perhaps, pale and soft, but rapidly increasing, and in a short time, from the extreme brightness, preventing any further vision. Nature therefore herself brings us to acknowledge that one single apparition of light was the first phenomenon on the earth. Nor was there anything in this of chance or accident, but all was governed by the command and wisdom of the Creator. God said, 'Let light be.' He commanded, that is, the light, or the luminous caloric or fire, to appear both *then*, and afterwards whenever the chemical combinations were sufficiently formed; and His command the bodies obeyed, just as they obey now in the luminous

combinations, or combustions. The sacred writer mentions only the first cause, viz. the command of God, and the visible effect; of the other effects he says nothing. For as he did not propose to himself to teach the Hebrews cosmogony or chemistry, it was useless for his purpose to speak of them. If I am not mistaken, this is so clearly the Mosaic light, that to try and make out there was another light seems to me like trying to light a smoking torch from a dirty heap of fat while the sun is shining at mid-day.<sup>25</sup>

The 'firmament' is, according to St. Augustine,<sup>26</sup> a middle region of air, now appointed by God as a 'firmament,' that is, a wall of division between the waters above, *i. e.* the clouds, and the waters below on the earth's surface. This wall of division was spread out between the two waters. It could not be at any great distance from the earth's surface, and the division of the waters in the formation of the 'firmament' just answers to the change which would be required to fit the earth for

<sup>25</sup> *In Historiam Creationis Mosaicam Commentatio*, auctore J. Baptista Pianciani, S.J. pp. 95, 96.

<sup>26</sup> Lib. ii. de Gen. ad lit. c. 4.

man and the higher animals. The vaporous atmosphere would have to be made breathable, the vapour to be partly deposited as water, and partly expanded as cloud. And if the 'firmament' in the account of the second day or period be understood to mean this middle region of air,<sup>27</sup> then it can hardly have a different meaning on the fourth day: and the *appointment* of the lights *in* the firmament may be understood of the giving motive power to the sun and the heavenly bodies, and of a farther change in the

<sup>27</sup> Cornelius a Lapide considers that by the word 'firmament' is meant the whole heaven of stars, and that it includes the entire space thence to the earth (*Com. in Gen. ad loc.*). Father Pianciani on this point says: 'In this matter it seems to me that this very simple explanation is to be preferred, viz. that this *firmament* or extension is the air or atmosphere, or that part of it which is not very elevated and rare, but low down and near to the earth, where are the clouds, through which the birds fly, and even man at times ascends in balloons. This part of the atmosphere is, both in Scripture and common speech, which the sacred writers at times adopt, called *cælum* (which Moses tells us is the same as *firmamentum*): thus we read, "qui operit cælum nubibus" (Ps. cxlvi.), and "triste et rubicundum cælum" (Matt. xvi.). Then we have these common expressions, "volucres cæli," and the like. And a little farther on, Moses says, "volatitem volare super faciem firmamenti cæli" (v. 20). St. Thomas says we may understand by the *firmament* which we read of as being made on the second day, *not* that firmament in which are the fixed stars, but that part of the air in which the clouds are condensed.' *In Historiam Creationis Mosaicam Commentatio*, p. 108.

atmosphere by which the sun and other luminaries were made available to the earth.

It may be well to mention here, in regard to the fossil remains of animals, that they have precisely an analogous structure of the eye to our own ; so that when they existed, that is, in the strata which immediately preceded the present order,—when the pre-Adamite quadrupeds existed, there must have been the same laws of light as at present. Either, then, the creation of the light here mentioned must have been previous to the creation of those animals, or it is not to be understood, which is more satisfactory, as a creation at all, but as a restitution of the earth's atmosphere when disturbed by certain convulsions and the intermixture of gases and vapours, to a capacity for transmitting light again. All that I think we require is, to see what the scientific *facts* are, and to have some general view of the possible explanation of Holy Scripture with regard to them. The difficulties which remain cannot, of course, lead us as Catholics to doubt the veracity of Scripture ; nor should they make us, on the other hand, doubt the evidence of our senses ;

but should be taken as a discipline for the intellect, bidding us carry into our studies the same faith in God with regard to things not distinctly revealed to us through His Church that we are called upon to exercise in the acceptance of the mysteries of religion. Not merely between science and science, but even in science itself, we have many instances of truths well ascertained, yet not reconciled: parallel lines, or rather lines apparently parallel, but of which we are obliged to conceive a point of junction somewhere beyond our present field of view.<sup>28</sup> And thus it is true, not only of reli-

<sup>28</sup> I think it right to mention that the above sentence was written, though certainly not with a view to publication, many years ago; and I am more than pleased to find that the Archbishop of Westminster, in his work above quoted on the *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, which to my mind is the most complete popular treatise on the Church yet written, has put forward the idea it contains in his own terse language: 'The most certain and exact sciences have residual difficulties which resist all tests and refuse all solution. The sciences most within our reach, of the natural order, and capable of demonstration, not only have their limits, but also phenomena which we cannot reconcile. How much more Revelation, which reaches into a world of which eternity and infinity are conditions, and belongs to an order above nature and the reason of man! It is no wonder that in the sphere of supernatural science there should be residual difficulties, such as the origin of evil, the freedom of the will, the eternity of punishment. They lie upon the frontier, beyond which, in this world, we shall

gious truth, but also of scientific, that man must school his intellect to trust truth beyond the point at which he can investigate it ; but it

---

never pass. Again, what wonder that the Holy Scriptures should contain difficulties which yield to no criticism, and that not only in the sphere of supernatural truth, but also of the natural order ; that is, of history, chronology, and the like. To hear some men talk, one would suppose that they were eye-witnesses of the creation, observers of the earth's surface before and after the flood, companions of the Patriarchs, chroniclers of the Jewish race. The history of the world for four thousand years, written in mere outline, with intervals of unmarked duration, . . . may well present difficulties and apparent improbabilities upon the surface, and yet after all be true. . . . I do not profess to be able to understand all the difficulties which may be raised. The history shows to me afar off like the harvest-moon just over the horizon, dilated beyond all proportion, and in its aspect unnatural ; but I know it to be the same heavenly light which in a few hours I shall see in a flood of splendour, self-evident, and without a cloud. So I am content to leave, as residual difficulties, the narratives which come down from an age when as yet the father of secular history had not been born. Why should we assume that we must render an account of all difficulties in Scripture any more than in revelation, or in revelation any more than in science ? Why should we be ashamed of saying, with St. Augustine, " Let us believe and immoveably affirm that in Scripture falsehood has no place." . . . And if it should seem irrational and perverse to shut our eyes to difficulties, as men say, we can but answer, We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written. The Scripture itself depends for its attestation upon the Witness who teaches us our faith, and that Witness is divine. Our faith rests upon an order of divine facts, which was already spread abroad throughout the world, when as yet

is a morbid state of mind which leads people to shrink from scientific facts, and it goes far towards bringing revelation into disrepute with men of science.

---

the Gospel of S. John was not written. Of what weight are any number of residual difficulties against this standing, perpetual, and luminous miracle? . . . One of these divine facts, and that which is the centre and source of all our certainty, is the perpetual voice of the Church of God. That voice has declared to us that the sacred books were written by inspiration, and that whatever those books contain, howsoever they may surpass the bounds of experience, and refuse the *criteria* of our statistics, and the *calculus* of our arithmetic, is simply to be believed because it is divinely true.' *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, p. 166 et seqq.

## LECTURE II.

### THE CREATION OF MAN.

THE first chapter of Genesis giving a summary of the work of creation, in the second chapter the details of man's creation are added ; so that this second chapter is an enlargement of the account relating to man given in the first chapter. We must notice this in order to give a right meaning to the 27th and 28th verses : ' And God created man to His own image, to the image of God He created him, male and female He created them : and God blessed them, saying : Increase and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the earth.'

The creation of woman also is there already mentioned, and everything with reference to their prerogative ; and yet in chapter ii. there comes the account of how God formed man,

and what He did with him, and the creation of woman. So that, as I said, this second chapter is an enlargement of part of the first.

The first thing to notice here is, that in comparing the expressions relating to man's creation with those in which the inferior works of God are spoken of, we find a marked difference. In regard to the latter, the simple command only of God is recorded, but in regard to man there seems to be a scheme, something like a consultation and design: 'Let us make man;' an inward act of the Divine mind, a consultation, so to say, among the three Divine Persons of the Blessed Trinity; and from the first, man's relation to the Godhead is put forward. The object and end of the creation of other things is stated to be the service of man; but man was created in the image of God, and therefore *his* end was to know, love, and serve God for ever.

The meaning of the expression 'image of God' appears most clearly from the passages of the New Testament in which it is spoken of. For instance: 'And put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice and

holiness of truth.<sup>1</sup> And again: 'And putting on the new (man), him who is renewed in knowledge, according to the image of Him who created him.'<sup>2</sup> It means, of course, the perfection of the understanding, perfection in knowledge, perfection of the will: the perfect ordering of all man's faculties and powers. Adam therefore at the first instant of his creation had infused into him, together with sanctifying grace, all the theological and moral virtues. He was, moreover, endowed with original justice, which, in addition to the virtues above named, consisted in the continual assistance of God, and by this all irregular appetites (or concupiscence) were hindered from outstripping the reason. And as the appetites were in subjection to the reason, so was the reason to God. Man thus enjoyed a perpetual inward peace, rectitude, and holiness, undisturbed by any inordinate grief, anger, or other unruly passion. This justice too and integrity, Adam, had he not sinned, would have transmitted to his posterity.

It was in possessing this *image* that man

<sup>1</sup> Eph. iv. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Col. iii. 10.

was differenced from the inferior animals. These have not the image of God, but rather what the Fathers call a 'vestigium,' an indication of origin. They represent God only in a certain qualified sense, viz. as the effect represents the cause; for their nature, habits, instincts, association with each other, point to the Divine Author of their being. But in no strict sense are they in the image of God; whereas man is impressed with it in a most wonderful manner. St. Augustine explains this *image* very beautifully. 'As,' he says, 'God the Father knowing Himself by His intellect produces the Word—viz. the Son—and in loving Him produces the Holy Spirit, so man by knowing himself produces in his mind the intelligible word, expressive of himself, and similar to himself, and thence proceeds in the will the love of the same. Thus man clearly represents the Trinity.'<sup>3</sup> This image of God is so intimately impressed on man's nature, that he cannot lose it. Sin has obscured, but cannot destroy it, as it cannot destroy man's nature.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Lib. x. *De Trinit.* c. 10, and lib. xiv. c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> St. Aug. *Retract.* lib. ii. c. 24.

The process of the creation of man given in the second chapter of Genesis is very concisely worded ; so that we must give the fullest meaning to the words to have their proper force : 'And the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul.'<sup>5</sup> In regard to the other creatures of God, no such personal agency of the Creator is mentioned as is specified of man's body : 'The Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth.' Of other creatures it is said : 'Let the waters bring forth,' or simply, 'God created.' The expression, 'breath of life,' which follows, is used frequently in Scripture of the mere animal life, as *e. g.* in the account of the Flood : 'And all things wherein is the breath of life.'<sup>6</sup> Here is meant mere animal life ; and yet the very same Hebrew word is applied to something beyond animal life, *e. g.* 'The spirit shall return to God who gave it,' and 'Into Thy hands I commend my spirit.' The Hebrew word for *spirit* in each of these passages is the same as 'breath,' and evidently implies an imperishable

<sup>5</sup> Chap. ii. v. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. vii. 22.

part. The term, then, 'breath of life' is to be understood in a higher sense when man's constitution is specified. And we can discern here the principle on which scriptural expressions are to be understood generally, viz. that the lower meaning and common is to be taken as a clue and as an analogical basis for the higher, just as all outward and visible things are to be interpreted of things spiritual. But yet in the expressions 'breath of life' and 'living soul' there is an inferiority implied to another state of man,<sup>7</sup> as appears clearly from the distinction in 1 Cor. xv. 45: 'The first man Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a quickening spirit;' and there  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , the 'living soul,' is clearly used as a term of disparagement, the adjective formed from it,  $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\chi\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ , meaning 'natural,' as opposed to  $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ , 'spiritual.'<sup>8</sup> The same idea, too, is expressed

<sup>7</sup> Speaking of our first parents, St. Augustine says: 'Qui licet morituri non essent, nisi peccassent, alimentis tamen ut homines utebantur, nondum spiritualia sed adhuc animalia corpora terrena gestantes.' (lib. xiii. *De Civ. Dei*). 'Who, although they would not have died had they not sinned, still, as men made use of food, not as yet having spiritual bodies, but animal and earthly ones.'

<sup>8</sup> 'The first man of the earth, earthy, was made into a living soul, not into a quickening spirit, which was reserved

in the 46th verse of the same chapter: 'Yet that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural: afterwards that which is spiritual.' This leads us to see that Adam at his creation was not in a consummate state; he was not yet in that complete *state* of perfection for which his nature was destined. Though sinless, he was but a living  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , and God intended that he should be a spiritual man  $\piνευματικ\omicron\varsigma$ , according to the words of St. Paul: 'Therefore as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us (or, we shall) bear also the image of the heavenly.'<sup>9</sup>

We may see, then, that from the first, man was meant for a progress, and an eventual pro-

---

for him through the merit of obedience.' But see the whole passage (lib. xiii. c. 23 *De Civ. Dei*).

St. Thomas, too, in reply to the objection taken from 1 Cor. xv. 45, that Adam was not created in grace, because he was not made into a vivifying spirit, which is effected by grace, says: 'St. Paul uses these words to show that there is a spiritual body as well as an animal body; because the life of the spiritual body began in Christ, who is the first-fruits from the dead, just as the life of the animal body began in Adam. The Apostle, then, does not mean by those words that Adam was not spiritual as to the soul, but that he was not spiritual as to the body.' (*Summa*, i. p. q. 95. a. 1, ad 1m.)

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 49.

motion. The earth in its then state, though good, was not designed to be the boundary of his prospect. The first man was of the earth, earthy. Though sin had not entered, it was earthy still. Man was not meant to rest there, but to be a companion everlastingly of spiritual beings, and to be fitted for a very different *state* from that in which he was created—for a spiritualised state, in which he should enjoy the vision of God. In his earthy state, in the Garden of Eden, he could not have this vision, from the simple fact of his being there, as we shall see, in a state of probation, which implies the possibility of turning from God, of committing sin; and this, to one in possession of the Beatific Vision, is impossible. St. Thomas, in his *Summa*, speaking of this probationary state in which man was created, states thus much in so many words;<sup>10</sup> and in a subsequent question he mentions this condition of *progress*, to which man was destined by God: ‘In reply, then, we must say that Paradise was a fitting place for the habitation of man, so far as the corruption of his first state is concerned. But that

<sup>10</sup> i. p. q. 94, a. 1.

incorruption was not natural to man, but came of the supernatural gift of God. In order, therefore, that this might be imputed to the grace of God, and not to human nature, God made man out of Paradise. . He then placed him *in* Paradise, there to dwell during the whole time of his animal life, but afterwards to be translated to Paradise when he had acquired a spiritual life.<sup>11</sup> And again : ‘ In answer to the first point, we must say that man in Paradise was not happy with that perfect happiness to which he was to be translated, and which consists in the vision of the Divine Essence ; still his life was happy in a certain way (as St. Augustine says, in Gen. ad lit. c. 18), in so far, that is, as he had integrity and a certain natural perfection.’<sup>12</sup> Man’s continuance upon the level on which he was created was put an end to by sin. Still, the original design of God was not frustrated ; for a second Adam was provided—not, like the first, a living soul only—*ψυχὴ*—but a life-giving spirit—*πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν*—capable of imparting to

<sup>11</sup> *Sum.* i. p. q. 102, a. 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Ib.* i. p. q. 94, a. 1.

others a new power, which in its growth should lift them out of the earthy state, and in its full bloom fit them for higher communion and a perfect state of external circumstances. And observe how exact is the parallel that we are to expect between the future recreation of man and the first creation. At the Resurrection the Lord God will again form man out of the dust of the ground, and breathe into his face the breath of life; and then there will be a new creation of outward circumstances to suit man's new condition: 'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth are gone, and the sea is now no more.'<sup>13</sup> The state of man will then be a spiritualised one. He will be *πνευματικός* like to his Lord; and the great gift of God under the Christian Dispensation—viz. the new nature recovered by man in Jesus Christ—is that which is to fit him for that spiritualised condition.

As to the formation of Eve, it was perhaps hardly possible that so mysterious an act on the part of God should have escaped the sar-

<sup>13</sup> Apoc. i. 1.

casm and raillery of rationalistic and infidel writers, who treat it, as they do other Biblical records beyond their comprehension, as a mere myth. But the statement stands clear and distinct in the Book of Genesis, that 'the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon Adam; and when he was fast asleep, He took one of his ribs and filled up flesh for it. And the Lord God built the rib which He took from Adam into a woman, and brought her to Adam' (c. ii. 21, 22). Now we have no more right to give even a figurative sense, *exclusive of the literal*, to this passage, than to any other historical narration, such, for instance, as 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;' or, 'God said, Let there be light, and there was light.' One of the very first canons in Hermeneutics, even as applied to profane history, is, that the literal sense of a passage is to be taken as the first and true one, unless some positive reason can be shown against it. This canon of itself suffices to establish the literal sense; for the whole context, the parallel passages, the traditions of the Jews and the Gentile nations, require this literal interpretation of the passage

concerning the formation of Eve. That it has a mystical and figurative sense is certainly true; but that mystical sense, so far from excluding, presupposes the literal one.

With reference to the formation of Eve, there seems to have been the same sort of scheme, so to say, in the Divine mind as we read of in the case of Adam's creation. The reason is clear. Adam is said to have been created 'in the image of God,' that image consisting, as we have seen, in moral perfection; in his possessing the gifts of reason, intellect, free-will, and moreover in his being endowed with supernatural gifts, and made capable of eternal happiness in the Vision of God. Now all this applies to Eve also, so that she too bore the Divine image. But there was still a difference between Adam and Eve in this respect: in Adam the Divine image shone forth in a way peculiar to himself. For, just as God is the first beginning and ultimate end of man, so the man is the immediate beginning and immediate end of the woman; for from man and for man was the woman created, as we read in the second chapter of Genesis. Thus it follows

that man has dominion over the whole of nature, not excepting woman. St. Paul alludes to this secondary likeness of man to God when he says: 'The man indeed ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. For the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.'<sup>14</sup> Thus we see that woman, even in her state of innocence, was in subjection to the man, being made for him as his helper and means for the procreation of the human race.<sup>15</sup> But it was a willing subjection, free from trouble or annoyance—the loving service of a help meet for him. After the Fall, that subjection became, as the woman's penalty, hard and painful, and, more frequently than not, repugnant, as the whole history of woman up to the coming in of the Gospel abundantly proves.

<sup>14</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 7, 8, 9.

<sup>15</sup> 'There is a twofold subjection: one servile, according to which the superior makes use of the subject for his own advantage; and of this kind was the subjection introduced after sin. But there is another subjection, economic and civil, according to which the superior makes use of those subject to him for their advantage and good; and such a subjection existed before sin. For the good of order would

It seems probable, from the words of Genesis relating to the formation of Eve, that she was not created in the same place as Adam, but that she was made by God from Adam's rib in Paradise, and then brought to Adam after he was placed there.

As I said before, we are bound to accept the account of the formation of Eve as a simply historical narrative. But over and above that, there does seem to be a deep mystical meaning underlying both God's acts and words in that mysterious scene, and the reception of Eve by Adam.

In the first place, the formation by God of Eve out of Adam's rib symbolises the indissolubility of marriage, that one man should be joined to one woman, and that till death: 'This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh.' It shows us, too, how great should be the holiness of the married state, and the

---

have been wanting in a human multitude, if some were not governed by others of greater wisdom. And thus, with a subjection of this sort, the woman is naturally subject to the man, because naturally man is gifted with greater prudence. The inequality of man is not excluded by a state of innocence.' (St. Thomas, *Summ.* p. 1. q. 92, a. 1.)

great love that should unite husband and wife ; that they should have, as it were, but one soul and one will. 'It was fitting,' says St. Thomas, 'that the woman should be formed from the man ; first, in order that the first man might preserve his dignity ; that, after the similitude of God, he might be the beginning of his whole species, as God is the beginning of the whole universe : as St. Paul says, "God has made of one all mankind." Secondly, to increase the love of man for woman, knowing that she was produced from him. Therefore is it said in Genesis, "She was taken from man ;" "wherefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife."'<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, there is prefigured in the formation of Eve the institution of the Church of Christ, which came from the transfigured side of the second Adam, as Eve from the rib of the first.

Mr. Allies puts this very beautifully : 'In the first creation of the human race the Body of Christ is not only foretold but prefigured, not only prefigured but expressed in the very words uttered by Adam in his ecstasy, the

<sup>16</sup> *Summ. i. p. q. 92, a. 2.*

words of God delineating that act of God, the greatest of all His acts of power, wisdom, and goodness, whereby becoming man, and leaving His Father and His mother, He would cleave to the wife He so took, the human nature which in redeeming He espoused. This, and no other, was the reason why Eve was formed out of Adam. It is the beginning of the Divine plan, which is coherent throughout, which was designed in the state of innocency, which remains intended through the state of guilt, which is unfolded in the state of grace, which is completed in the state of glory, when what that forming of Eve from the side of Adam, and of the Church from the side of her Lord, what that growth through thousands of years, through multitudinous conflicts, through unspeakable sorrows, through immeasurable triumphs, shall finally issue in, shall be seen by those whom the second Adam has made worthy of that vision, and by whom it is seen enjoyed.<sup>17</sup>

Passing now from the circumstances of

<sup>17</sup> T. W. Allies, *Formation of Christendom*, part ii. pp. 113, 114.

man's creation, we come to the place and the employment first assigned to him. He had been commanded to be fruitful and multiply; to replenish the earth and subdue it; that is, the whole earth was given to him to occupy; yet a part of it, a particular place, was especially prepared for him. It was not enough that the creative word had caused the earth to bring forth its herbs and fruits; a stronger personal agency is recorded on the Creator's part for man's accommodation: 'And the Lord God had planted a paradise of pleasure from the beginning, wherein He placed man whom He had formed.'<sup>18</sup> This paradise, or Garden of Eden, as the LXX. translate it, was enriched, by the special care of Almighty God with the choicest of external goods. It was not to be the only part of the earth for man's abode, but his place of special enjoyment. And we may see here, I think, a great meaning. Why was there a special home in this way provided for man? On the same principle in which God distinguished between day and day, and set apart the seventh day, though all days were

<sup>18</sup> Gen. ii. 8.

good, to be peculiarly sanctified and a blessing; so between place and place God made differences of holiness for the benefit of man's spiritual nature, as well as the refreshment of his bodily frame. This paradise, then, we are to look upon as the sanctuary of the world, the inner part of the tabernacle, which at first was co-extensive with the world. There was to be a special manifestation of God's presence there. The Lord God, Scripture tells us, walked amidst the trees of the garden, and His voice was heard there. Elsewhere man would, of course, be in the presence of God, who filleth all in all; but *here* that presence would be specially manifested to him. Here, too, were outward and visible objects to bring the thought of God to his mind, and not only to act on his understanding, but to convey to him a real spiritual communication. The *tree of life*<sup>19</sup> was in the midst of the garden. That tree was differenced from all other trees in regard to its effect on man, as is clear from the words of God Him-

<sup>19</sup> Cornelius a Lapide (*ad loc.*) says that it is of faith that this was a real tree; for the Hebrew word used here means tree, and the narrative of Moses requires us so to understand it.

self: 'lest perhaps he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.'<sup>20</sup> It was, then, a sacramental tree:<sup>21</sup> *i. e.* the visible and tangible fruit was the means of conveying to man a renewal of life,<sup>22</sup> kept him free from disease, strengthened him, and fended off sadness and melancholy.

'The venerable Bede teaches that in that tree (*lignum vitæ*) there was a sacrament of eternal life, which was to be gained by obedience; and Jacobus Saragensis, according to Moses Bar Cepha, in the 2d book *De Paradiso*, attributed a certain hidden efficacy to its fruit, on account of the sacrament of Christ veiled in the tree. For Christ of His own nature was

<sup>20</sup> Gen. iii. 22.

<sup>21</sup> St. Thomas says, the 'tree of life' was so called because it had the virtue of preserving life; and he adds, 'still it also signifies something *spiritualiter*,' that something being, no doubt, the promise of eternal life, that Adam was to acquire by his obedience.

<sup>22</sup> 'They were nourished, therefore, by the other trees of which they partook, lest their animal bodies should suffer in any way from hunger and thirst; but the reason they took of the tree of life was lest death should creep over them, or they should perish by lapse of time from old age. Just as the other trees were for food, so this was as a sacrament. (St. Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, c. 13). And in c. 26 of the same book the Saint says again that in Paradise '*cibus erat homini, ne esuriret, potus ne sitiret, et lignum vitæ ne senectus eum dissolveret.*'

life, and wherever He is near, there death is far away. By this tree, so far as it was sacramental and a symbol of eternal or celestial life, Adam was taught that life lay out of himself, and once obtained would completely fend off death and render him incorruptible; that that life was to be sought in God, who has in Himself life unchangeable; that that was the true food of the soul, which doth not perish, which transforms into itself those who partake of it, and renders them immortal, but is not transformed into them, as is the case with fleshly food. Moreover, it is right to consider that by this symbol the Son of God was manifested to Adam as the Author of Life. For He, in various passages, is signified under the analogous name of "tree of life." Prov. iii. : "She (wisdom) is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her, and he that shall retain her is blessed." Apoc. ii. 7 : "To him that overcometh, I will give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of my God." St. John i. 4 : "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." And in xiv. 6 : "I am the way, the truth, and the life." And in vi. 51, 52 : "I

am the living Bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh for the life of the world." And in verse 58: "As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me."<sup>23</sup>

This virtue, moreover, St. Thomas says,<sup>24</sup> was not *supernatural*, but *natural* to the tree: just as healing virtue attaches even now to certain herbs; so that after the Fall the tree still retained its restoring power; and for that reason Adam after his sin was driven from the garden lest he should eat of it. Had he remained faithful, the eating of the fruit of this tree would have kept him in a state of immortality, and so he would have continued, till God removed him to heaven without the process of dying.

As to the mode in which this tree of life effected immortality in Adam, St. Thomas says: 'We say, then, in reply, that the tree of life caused immortality in a particular way, but not *simpliciter*. To see this clearly, we must con-

<sup>23</sup> Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl. Vet. Test.* t. i. pp. 46, 47.

<sup>24</sup> Cornelius a Lap. *Com. in Gen.* ad loc.

sider that man in his first state possessed two remedies for the preservation of life against two defects. In the *first* defect is the loss of moisture by the action of natural heat, which is the instrument of the soul: and against this defect man was helped by the eating of the other trees of Paradise; just as we now are helped by the food we consume. The *second* defect is, because, as the philosopher says, 1. *De Generat.* (tex. 34 and 39 to. 2), that which is generated from anything extraneous, added to what it first was, the moisture preëxisting, diminishes the active virtue of the species: water *e.g.* added to wine is first converted into the flavour of wine, but according as more is added it diminishes the strength of the wine, and at last the wine becomes watery. We see, therefore, that at first the active virtue is so strong that it can convert from food not only what suffices for the restoration of what is lost, but what suffices for increase; but afterwards what is generated in addition to this does not suffice for increase, but simply for the restoration of what is lost. But at last, in the state of old age, it does not suffice even for this; so that decrease

ensues, and finally the dissolution of the body. Against this defect man was helped by the tree of life. For this had the power of strengthening the virtue of the species against the weakness arising from the admixture of extraneous (matter). . . . It did not, however, bestow immortality *simpliciter* : for neither was the virtue, which was inherent to the soul for the preservation of the body, caused by the tree of life, nor could it bestow the disposition of immortality to the body, so as to prevent its ever being dissolved. This is evident from the fact that the virtue of every body is finite. So that the virtue of the tree of life could not extend so far as to give to the body the power of lasting an infinite time, but only a determined time. It is manifest, then, that in proportion as any virtue is greater, the more durable is the effect it produces. So that as the virtue of the tree of life was finite, when taken once it preserved from corruption for a definite time, at the end of which man would either have been translated to a spiritual life, or he would have again needed to eat of the tree of life.’<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Sum. i. p. q. 97, a. 4.*

St. Bonaventure says:<sup>26</sup> 'As our Sacraments, then, do not create grace, but the Divine virtue, helping them in their legitimate reception, infuses grace, so the fruit of that tree did not bestow immortality, but the Divine virtue, when that fruit was eaten, conferred on man immortality.'

The great probability is, that Adam did never, in fact, eat of the tree of life. Cornelius a Lapide says, in a commentary on Gen. ii. 9: 'Adam never did taste of the tree of life; for shortly after his creation he sinned and was driven from Paradise, as appears from Gen. ii. 9.' And St. Anselm says that Adam was only seven hours in Paradise before he sinned, 'because no sooner was woman created than she prevaricated.'<sup>27</sup>

Now this opens out to us a very interesting train of thoughts as to man's original condition. He was not in what we may call a sort of angelic state in the department of external things. His body needed food and rest and restoration of the vital power, and all this the

<sup>26</sup> In 2m sententiarum dist. xvii.

<sup>27</sup> *Elucidarium*, c. xiv.

sacramental tree of life held out to him. And here we may see a feature of difference between the old creation and the future one, between the earthy state and the spiritual one at the end of the world. In that future state man will really be 'like unto the angels of God;' he will be independent of external things, or at least to a much higher degree than Adam was in Paradise.

The view given above of the nature of the Garden of Eden as the sanctuary of the world, and of the tree of life as the Sacrament by which Adam was to be kept in a state of immortality, is confirmed by the general tenor of Holy Scripture, and the references made to them throughout the Bible. For instance, in respect to Paradise, or the Garden of Eden—those figurative prophecies of Isaias, which we know relate to man's spiritual blessedness under the Christian Dispensation, and the improvement of his moral nature, are couched in terms which certainly refer to the Garden of Eden mainly, and to the state of things there: 'I will open rivers in the high hills, and fountains in the midst of the plains: I will turn the de-

sert into pools of waters, and the impassable land into streams of waters. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, and the thorn, and the myrtle, and the olive-tree: I will set in the desert the fir-tree, the elm and the box-tree together.'<sup>28</sup> 'For I will pour out waters upon the thirsty grounds, and streams upon the dry land: I will pour out My spirit upon thy seed, and My blessing upon thy stock. And they shall spring up among the herbs as willows beside the running streams.'<sup>29</sup> 'The Lord therefore will comfort Sion, and will comfort all the ruins thereof: and He will make her desert as a place of pleasure, and her wilderness as the garden of the Lord.'<sup>30</sup>

The world is spoken of in these passages as no garden at all, but a wilderness which God will plant once more with every tree that is pleasant to the sight. And it shall have its river to water the garden and to go forth into the world. That is the meaning of God's planting the cedar in the wilderness, and setting the fir-tree in the desert.

<sup>28</sup> *Isaias* xli. 18, 19.

<sup>29</sup> *Ib.* xliv. 3, 4.

<sup>30</sup> *Ib.* li. 3.

In the book of the prophet Ezekiel<sup>31</sup> this figure is most largely developed. It is the vision of the holy waters. The prophet beholds a river flowing from under the threshold of God's house; then a net-work of many trees; and the waters issue towards the east country. Again in the Apocalypse we have the same figure: 'And he showed me a river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street thereof, and on both sides of the river, was the tree of life, bearing twelve fruits, yielding it fruits every month, and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no curse any more.'<sup>32</sup>

The figure, then, of the Garden of Eden and of its waters is the scriptural picture employed to denote man's restoration to a high spiritual state, to spiritual liberty, and intercourse with his Maker. We may refer, too, to the common use made in the Book of Proverbs of the expression 'tree of life.' Everything that is morally good is spoken of there as 'a

<sup>31</sup> c. xlvii.

<sup>32</sup> Apoc. xxii. 1-3.

tree of life.' For instance, chap. iii. 18, 'She is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her;' xi. 30, 'The fruit of the just man is a tree of life;' xii. 12, 'Desire when it cometh is a tree of life;' xv. 4, 'A peaceable tongue is a tree of life,' *i.e.* a renewal and infusion of health into man's spiritual being.

There is, then, a great analogy running through the whole of man's different stages; and we are not *absolutely* cut off from the condition to which man was created. It is not as though in regard to God, the soul, and religion generally, the Fall made an irrevocable change; analogous privileges were continued to man. At first, before sin came into the world, man had his special place of meeting with God, his sacrifice, his Sacrament to which he could put forth his hand and eat, that he might be strengthened and invigorated. And in regard to bodily labour, though there was no curse, he still had his work, for he was put in the Garden of Eden 'to dress it and to keep it,' and one day out of seven that bodily labour was to cease, and he was to be at leisure in God's house to walk with God. After the Fall,

though man had not the tree of life available to him, he still had his spiritual privileges and his sacrifice. But observe the change. *Before* the Fall his sacrifice might well have consisted of the fruits of the earth, as sufficing to represent the duty of a creature towards the Creator; but after it, it was necessary that an atonement should be shadowed forth, that the necessity of a death should appear in it, and therefore an animal was appointed as victim of the sacrifice, whose blood was to be shed.

## LECTURE III.

### THE TEMPTATION ; THE FALL.

IN the condition of Adam at his creation we have seen an *analogy* to man's circumstances under every dispensation. The same extends to the trial to which Adam was subjected ; for it is clear that he was created unto a state of probation. The fact of a prohibition being immediately given him shows this. Moreover, an outward object, as a memorial of that prohibition, was placed side by side with the other outward memorial and means of his renovation. In the midst of the garden, besides the tree of life, was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. 'It is of faith,' says Cornelius a Lapide, 'that this tree was a real tree, for the Jews so understand the word ; and moreover the simple and historical narrative of Moses requires us thus to understand it : and so think all the old Fathers, in opposition to Origen and Eugubinus, who

consider the tree merely symbolical, signifying, that is, symbolically to Adam both the life and the immortality promised him if he obeyed God.<sup>1</sup>

The knowledge of good and evil is in itself a benefit: indeed, it is an attribute of God and high spiritual beings: 'Adam is become as one of us, knowing good and evil;' and as was said to Daniel: 'My Lord is like an angel of God to know good and evil.' It does not simply mean experimental knowledge of good and evil, because in the case of God and good angels this would be impossible. The tree of knowledge of good and evil does not mean simply the tree by partaking of the fruit of which men should know good and evil, and by contrast the value of the good; just as a person by taking poison might experience the difference of health and sickness, and so gain more accurate knowledge of both. No doubt it was a tree of knowledge of good and evil in this sense; for Adam learnt by bitter experience, after his sin, how good a thing obedience was, and how evil disobedience: for he was driven from Paradise and from his state of happiness.

<sup>1</sup> Cornelius a Lap. ad loc.

But even before the Fall it was called a tree of knowledge of good and evil, and therefore in some sense it must have been so to him. St. John Chrysostom seems to allow this, though he says that the tree took its name *ab eventu*: 'For the tree is called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because a command had been given concerning the tree, by occasion of which either his obedience or disobedience was exercised. Adam knew, indeed, before that obedience was good, and disobedience evil; but he learnt it afterwards more clearly by experience. Just as we also know that health is a good thing, and sickness an evil thing, before we experience it, but know much more surely the difference between the two when we fall sick. So, in the same way, Adam knew that obedience was a good thing, and disobedience an evil thing; but knew it more clearly when, after having tasted of the tree, he was cast out from Paradise, and fell from his state of happiness.'<sup>2</sup>

It seems, then, to have been a tree of good and evil by its moral teaching; by its expressing to man the law of God; for wherever there

<sup>2</sup> St. John Chrys. Serm. vii. in Gen.

is a precept of God, *there* is the knowledge of good and evil, viz. by obedience and disobedience. The precept sets forth the two : 'Obey, and have the good; disobey, and have the evil.' Man, being in the image of God, must have had, independently of his outward precept, the inward law written in his heart; for in that consists the Divine image mainly—moral perfection. This outward precept, then, did not answer to the moral law, but to what we call positive precepts. Adam, therefore, had, over and above the moral law written in his conscience, a positive prohibition, and an outward and visible object to remind of that prohibition, of his dependence upon God, of his duty not to follow his own inclination in all things, but to respect every word that came out of the mouth of God. It was in this way that the tree served as a tree of knowledge of good and evil. 'Man thus constituted' (that is, in a state of justice and holiness), says M. Laforet, 'was to be put upon his trial. God therefore will give him a command: and as, with regard to the body, he belongs to the world of sense, the precept of God will attach to an object subject to the

senses. Let us listen to the words of Genesis: "And God commanded man, saying: Of every tree of Paradise thou shalt eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death." It is by this precept that God tried man, made him especially feel his dependence, and gave him at the same time the consciousness of his moral liberty. If we reflect carefully, we shall be easily convinced that we only acquire the consciousness of our moral liberty by the presence of a commandment, which prohibits our overstepping certain limits: there must be an obstacle before us, which arrests and limits our activity, and so obliges us to look inwards on ourselves, and to acknowledge that there exists an external rule from which we may step aside, and to which we are bound to submit ourselves. From that moment we understand, we see clearly and distinctly, that we can do good or evil, according as we follow or transgress this rule: and in this consists the consciousness of moral liberty. Adam, then required a definite precept to awaken in him, this clear and vivid consciousness of his

moral liberty : and as man, with regard to the body, is intimately connected with the world of sense, it was fitting that this precept should fall on an object of sense. Is it not because the tree of Paradise, which God had prohibited man to touch, was to produce this effect, that the Scripture, in its profound and mysterious language, gives it the name of the tree of knowledge of good and evil ?”

But let us see the analogy a little more closely. We are in a state of trial; in the first place, from the positive precepts, divine and ecclesiastical, which the Church is always putting before us; and also, though in a lower and different sense, from the test which outward things are continually applying to us. The world, as it is called, which means everything of sight and sense, is proving us. Nothing that we use, no intercourse that we have with outward things, even our fellow-men, who in this respect are part of the world, but tests and searches us, serves as the material for the knowledge of good and evil, being associated with Divine precepts, as *e. g.*: ‘Love not the

\* *Les Dogmes Catholiques*, par N. J. Laforet, t. ii. p. 6.

world, nor the things which are in the world ;' or again, ' to use the world as not abusing it ;' or, ' if you live after the flesh, you shall die.'

Now the state of Adam would, so far, have been very different to ours in that respect, had he not had such a visible test as the tree of knowledge of good and evil ; because before sin entered into the world, it does not seem likely that external objects generally would have so tested his obedience, though *now* everything is to us a tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There is a temptation and a trial in it. It tests the rectitude of our conscience, of our faith in God and His appointed Teacher. But this action of external things on us seems to derive its searching virtue from the entrance of sin into the world, and the actual want of harmony between our moral nature and the will of God, or of our own nature with itself. ' We all of us have, so to say, our mouths made to water by the forbidden fruit which our first parents eat : and we convulsively direct both eye and hand to that tree of rationalism, which kills the soul by its pretended knowledge of good and evil, by substituting the authority of

the intellect for that of conscience, and by only enlightening the latter by that light of experience which is from below, and which only allows the good to be seen by the lurid glimmering of remorse. We daily hear, in the secret of our hearts, that cry of revolt against duty, "Why hath God prohibited you?" which is as the hissing of the serpent: we feel insinuating itself little by little, and gliding, so to say, round our souls, the attraction of the prohibition, and the seduction of pleasure, which is presented to us as good fruit; and lastly, we yield to that promise of pride, the accomplice of all our passions, "Ye shall be as gods," that is, you shall be arbiters of your own lot, and happy with a happiness of your own making. Then the voice of remorse is heard; the illusion is dispelled, and we find ourselves stripped of our dignity and self-respect; we are afraid because we are naked.<sup>4</sup> Here, again, there is another point of resemblance, and a very remarkable one, between Adam's state and our own. He had his outward and visible test, his world, as it were, set before him in a small compass; and though

<sup>4</sup> *Etudes phil. sur le Christianisme*, t. ii. l. 2, c. iii. p. 20.

the trial to us is of a more painful and constant character, yet Adam himself in his state of perfection was not without it.

The qualities of the tree are described thus : 'good to eat,' 'fair to the eyes,' 'delightful to behold.' The test, then, which this outward object applied bore upon several faculties of man. It did not merely appeal to the lower appetites, but also to man's intellect. It applied the test probably to his whole nature. We may compare the description of these qualities of the forbidden tree with St. John's description of what is in the world : 'the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life,' which, the Apostle says, 'are not of the Father, but of the world.'<sup>5</sup> Just, then, the same sort of trial which the world is continually making of us, the tree of knowledge was making of Adam.

In the temptation to which our Blessed Lord chose to subject Himself we find the same tests applied. *Inwardly* tempted, of course, He could not be, but *outwardly* He was tempted to satisfy the concupiscence of the flesh by con-

<sup>5</sup> 1 St. John ii. 16.

verting stones into bread ; the concupiscence of the eyes by the vision of all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them ; and the pride of life, the desire of superiority, by throwing Himself off the pinnacle of the Temple in proof of His Divinity. And these tests are rightly considered as representing our own threefold trial. The simplicity of the test which Adam had, as compared with the complexity of our own, must be referred to the simplicity of his external circumstances generally. Just as his sacramental sign was a tree, so the test of his obedience was a tree too ; his outward enjoyments and the provision made for his bodily wants consisting of the same kind of object : and just as the life to which the one tree bore reference was a higher life than that of the body, so the death to which the other tree pointed was more than a bodily death.<sup>6</sup> They are in fact correlative terms, death being the negation of life. ' In what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the

<sup>6</sup> ' In the very violation of the precept, he (Adam) incurred the death of the soul ; for the Divine threat pointed also to this.' (Cajet. de Fulgure, *Inst. Theol.* t. vi. p. 20.) See also note in the previous Lecture, giving St. Thomas's opinion to the same effect.

death ;' that is, thou shalt lose that life to which the other tree pointed, over and above its support of the life of the body.

Man being placed in a state of probation, it is certainly quite conceivable that he might have fallen without any external assault. His own faculties thus tested might have given way. Such, in fact, was the fall of Lucifer and his angels, 'who kept not their first estate.' They fell, not from an evil one tempting them, but through the action of their own will ; and so it might have been with man. Evidently, irrespective of the entrance of the Tempter into Eden, he was on his trial, and that of course implies the possibility of failing. But Adam did not fall after the similitude of Satan's transgression. He fell through treachery and deception practised on him by a being of superior powers. It is remarkable that in the account of man's fall there is no express mention made of the evil being who caused it, but only of the visible form in which he masked himself. That it was Satan, we know ; but Holy Scripture only mentions this at its close.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Apoc. xii. 9.

It does not appear, either, whether Adam and Eve were aware who the Tempter was. They might have known nothing more than what they saw ; and yet, possessing perfect knowledge, they must at least have wondered at hearing the animal speak. St. Thomas says that Eve did so wonder, and at the same time partly suspected the truth, viz. that it was done by a higher power, whether angelical or diabolical. Afraid she was not, for she had not yet sinned, and knew, moreover, that she was under God's special care.\* Until the sin was committed, they could hardly have had a clear idea of the real state of the case. It would surely have been in vain for the Tempter to have appeared in his own character, for they could not have yielded to a professed enemy of God. He therefore was constrained to assume a neutral character at the least, and so appeared under the form of a serpent.

If now we ask why Satan chose that form, the reason seems to be this : ' The serpent was more subtle than any of the beasts of the earth which the Lord God had made.' That verse

\* St. Thomas, *Sum.* i. p. q. 94, a. 4.

appears to refer to the animal ; for just, as differences of disposition are exhibited in different brute animals, so subtlety is exhibited in the serpent, so as to afford a natural symbol of it, just as a lion does of strength and fearlessness. Satan being constrained to assume an outward form—for he could not suggest evil thoughts and desires in any other way, having as yet no part in man,<sup>9</sup> and being at the same time under the control of God—was perhaps necessitated<sup>10</sup> to adopt that form which was symbolical of his own character, and expressive of the work he was

\* St. Thomas, in answer to the objection, that, our first parents being less inclined to things of sense than to intelligible things, it was more fitting that they should have been tempted by a more inward suggestion, says : ‘ To the second we must say, that a suggestion by which the devil suggests anything spiritually to man exhibits the devil as having more power over man than an external suggestion could have, because by an internal suggestion, at the least, the imagination of man is changed, but by an external suggestion only an external creature is changed. But before sin the devil had the least possible power over man, and therefore he could not tempt him by an interior suggestion, but only by an external one.’ (*Sum.* ii. 2 p. q. 162, a. 2.)

<sup>10</sup> St. Thomas quotes St. Augustine to the effect that the choice by the devil of the animal serpent for the purpose of the temptation was overruled by God. It was the only animal God allowed him to choose : ‘ Non debemus opinari, quod serpentem sibi, per quem tentaret, diabolus eligeret ; sed cum esset in illo decipiendi cupiditas, nonnisi per illud animal potuit, per quod posse permissus est.’ (*Summa*, ii. 2 p. q. 165, a. 2, ad 3m.)

now commencing. The reason therefore that is given for the serpent's share in the Temptation, viz. that it was more subtle than any of the beasts of the earth, may be the reason why God allowed Satan to assume that form. The external suggestion which the Evil Spirit made under the form of the serpent gave the impulse in a wrong direction to man's inward nature. It was not the test which God had appointed, but an evil influence acting through that which proved too much for Eve. As to Adam's part, his motives, and the process by which he yielded, remain unexplained. St. Paul's language, in 1 Tim. ii. 14, would seem to exempt Adam from the immediate delusion of the serpent: 'Adam was not seduced, but the woman, being seduced, was in the transgression.' But still both Adam and Eve believed the words of the serpent, who promised them omniscience and immortality if they eat of the forbidden tree. They were in fact both blinded by pride at the serpent's words, 'You shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' Almighty God indeed upbraids Adam with this: 'Behold Adam is become as one of us, knowing good and evil;' for these

words were uttered in irony, and signified what Adam hoped for from eating of the tree, according to the serpent's words ; but what he did not attain to. Adam, then, believed the serpent's words as related by Eve, and so he lost his faith, disbelieving God, who had said, 'in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death.'<sup>11</sup>

If, then, Adam was not directly deceived, how did he give way ? He tells us himself in his answer to Almighty God : 'The woman, whom Thou gavest me to be my companion, gave me of the tree, and I did eat ;' as though the temptation had come to Adam through those very affections which God had given him for woman ; as though his sympathy with her had made him forget his allegiance to God. St. Paul, in the passage above given, implies that the greater guilt was Eve's ;<sup>12</sup> and there-

<sup>11</sup> Cornelius a Lapide has the following comment on the words of St. Paul to Timothy : 'Eve was seduced by the serpent, who wished to seduce her to eat the apple. Adam was not deceived by the serpent, but only enticed by his wife, who did not intend to deceive him.'

<sup>12</sup> 'If we consider the conditions on the part of the sinner, the man sinned more grievously than the woman, on account of the excellence of his gifts and the preëminence of his position ; but if we consider the conditions on the part

fore she is to carry a mark of subjection and inferiority. But the entire process of Adam's yielding does not appear on the surface of Scripture. His motives somehow must have been of a higher kind; for there was not so direct a departure from good to evil as in the case of Eve. Perhaps, as Cornelius a Lapide says, Satan dared not attack Adam; but Eve he saw was weaker in her allegiance to God, and so promised an easy victory.

The effect of the transgression we must compare with the command given. God had said: 'In what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death.' The result is stated to have been: 'and the eyes of them both were opened, and they perceived themselves to be

---

of the sin, the woman sinned more grievously than the man, as well on account of her impiety towards God as her sin against her neighbour.' (St. Bonavent. in 2m dist. xxii. a. 1, q. 8.) St. Thomas too, on this point, says: 'If we look at the sin in itself, Eve sinned most grievously, both because she was the first to *sin*, and because she led Adam into sin, and so was the ruin of herself and him, and of us all; but if we look at the circumstance of the *person*, it appears that Adam sinned most grievously, both because he was more perfect and more prudent than Eve, and because Adam had received the precept immediately from God, whereas Eve received it only mediately, that is, through Adam.' (*Sum.* ii. 2 p. q. 168, a. 4.)

naked.' That, then, is an indication of *the death* having taken place, the loss of original justice and integrity ; and the 'nakedness' implies a sense of that loss. Hitherto they had been satisfied with their state before God ; now they felt the defect which existed in their very nature.

We have seen, then, that the serpent in the Temptation must have been both a real animal and a mere instrument of an invisible agent ; and moreover, that the animal, besides serving as the instrument, was a symbol in its habits of the power that employed him. These considerations are necessary to our understanding the sentence pronounced on the serpent. That sentence regards both the animal and the power whose agent he was. It is a real sentence on the animal, but comprehends a sentence of a much higher order. To Adam and Eve the invisible power at this time was a mystery. To Eve it was evidently the animal serpent employed by some superior power ; what, she did not know. It might not yet have come to their knowledge that there was such a being as Satan. They could not therefore, perhaps,

see the *whole* meaning of the sentence ; but regarding the animal serpent, they saw probably no farther than the bearing of the sentence on the nature and condition of the animal.

In the first place, the cursing of the animal serpent, the unconscious,<sup>13</sup> or at all events the involuntary instrument, is consistent with God's justice, because the Fall affected in some mysterious way all creation, according to the words of St. Paul : ' Every creature groaneth and travaileth in pain even till now ;' and it was only making a difference in point of outward appearance between the serpent and other animals for the instruction of man. The case is just analogous to the curse on the barren fig-tree, which of course was simply a figure for man's warning. Some have supposed that a change of some kind took place in the habits of the serpent after the Fall, seeing that the Tempter

<sup>13</sup> ' For neither did the serpent understand the sound of the words which came from him to the woman ; for we are not to believe that his soul was converted into a rational nature ; for not even do men, who have a rational nature, understand what they say when the devil speaks in them. The serpent, therefore, spoke to man just as the ass on which Balaam sat spoke to man, except that the former was a diabolical work, the latter an angelical one.' (St. Aug. quoted by St. Thomas, *Sum.* ii. 2 p. q. 165, a. 2 ad 4m.)

could not have used as his instrument a loathsome object. It may have been so ; but it is hardly necessary to suppose it. Before the Fall the serpent no doubt had his place and dignity, as a creature of God, among the animals ; for all that God created was *good*. He may have crept on his belly, and eaten earth, as being *natural* to him ; and this and his outward aspect were not as yet loathsome to man. But after the Fall, those habits which were natural to him were turned into a penalty for man's instruction. ' Why,' says Cornelius a Lapide, ' should natural gifts, which were not even taken away from the devils on account of their sin, be taken away from the serpent, that had committed no sin ?'<sup>14</sup> Then, and as a consequence of the curse, he did become an object of hatred and loathing to man. We have a sort of analogy to this in the rainbow, which existed as a natural phenomenon before the Flood, but afterwards became the sign of the covenant between God and man.<sup>15</sup>

The important part of the sentence, however, is that which it symbolises, the sentence,

<sup>14</sup> Vide Cornelius a Lapide ad loc.

<sup>15</sup> Ad loc.

that is, on the Tempter himself, and the change which at this time was brought on him. It implies, with reference to the Tempter, a condition from this time forward to low and humiliating artifices, in which he should have but miserable success, disappointment being mingled with all his hopes; that being, it would seem, the meaning of 'eating dust.' Thus the great actor in the case was to be punished by receiving the very reverse of what he had aimed at. He had thought to become lord of mankind, to obtain this new race for his servants and worshippers, and thereby to be a rival, as it were, of the Most High. Instead of that, even his victims were to be his superiors, and in the successes that he might gain over them he himself was to be the greatest sufferer; and instead of assuming an aspect of rivalry to God, instead of having more open power to satisfy his ambition, he would be obliged to descend to habits such as his pride and ambition would feel most painfully.

The promise of the enmity between the serpent and the woman, and the seed of each, is the most important part of the sentence. The

former part simply affects Satan's condition, but this affects ours. It is in fact, as Father Perrone says, the first preaching of the Gospel, and a Gospel coextensive with mankind. It is not simply the promise of a future good. It is a promise that just as Satan deceived and overcame the first woman Eve, so *the* woman, in the person of Mary the second Eve, should overcome him, and be the means of crushing his power and restoring mankind to their lost privileges. All mankind, therefore, have the promise of this enmity, and a share, if they will, in Mary's victory through her Seed; but they may themselves abandon that enmity against Satan, and then they become identified with Satan's seed, and evidence it by their acts. This enmity was to exist between Satan and Mary, between Satan and *the Seed*, and between the great evil spirit and all mankind as engrafted on that Seed. It was an enmity, moreover, which required God's *putting*: 'I will put enmities,' &c.; and here, as I said, we can see a very distinct reference to the Immaculate Conception of Mary the *second* Eve. 'This prophecy is commonly and rightly called *πρωτευαγγέλιον*, for it exhibits

the promise of a future Redeemer, by whose power, sin, brought into the world by the devil lying hidden under the form of the serpent, was to be taken away; and thus at last the captivity, in which the whole human race was held on account of that sin, was to be loosened. Since, therefore, in these threatening words it is announced to the serpent that a time will come when a woman shall crush his head, by this fact is declared the victory of the woman over the serpent, or over the sin which by his persuasion had been committed, and was to be propagated through the world. Now the victory of the woman could not be considered complete, if she too had ever been tainted with sin, even at the instant in which she was first conceived.<sup>16</sup> The first Eve was a responsible agent in the Temptation and Fall, and she had voluntarily placed herself under the power of God's enemy. The *second* Eve, Mary, was never at any time to be in that condition. God would put enmities between her and Satan, and put them from the first. Grace, and fulness of grace, was to come to her from

<sup>16</sup> Perrone, *De Imm. B. M. V. Conceptu*, p. 34.

the first moment of her being ; so that just as Eve was the willing instrument by which Satan gained his end, and brought death into the world, so Mary was, on the other hand, to be the willing instrument in God's hands by which life, in *the Seed*, was to be restored to man.<sup>17</sup>

The remaining part of the sentence on the serpent brings out the same idea still more strongly : ' She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.' This, in its primary sense, means of course (whether we read ' ipse' with the Septuagint and Chaldee versions, ' ipsa' with all the Latin versions, or

<sup>17</sup> ' In the beginning, by the sin of our first parents, death passed upon all men ; to-day, through Mary, we are translated from death to life. In the beginning, the serpent filled the ears of Eve, and the poison spread thence over the whole body ; to-day, Mary from her ears received the champion of eternal happiness. What, therefore, was an instrument of death, was an instrument of life also.' (St. Ephrem Syrus, *Opp. Syr.* iii. p. 607, quoted by F. Newman in his letter to Dr. Pusey.)

St. Chrysostom too, in his homily *De Interd. arboris vitæ*, says : ' Death through Adam ; life through Christ. The serpent seduced Eve ; Mary gave consent to Gabriel ; but the seduction of Eve brought death, the consent of Mary brought a Saviour into the world. What had been lost through Eve is restored through Mary ; through Christ is redeemed what was brought into captivity through Adam ; through Gabriel is promised what through the devil had been despaired of.' (Quoted by Cornelius a Lapide, *ad loc.*)

'ipsum' with the Hebrew codices) that the woman, the second Eve, Mary, should, by her deliberate consent to the Incarnation, crush the head of Satan, by bringing into the world the Word made Flesh, *the Seed* emphatically. The 'lying in wait for her heel' indicates the insidious attempts which Satan henceforth would make to nullify the effects of the promise made; and his first recorded attempt was against the person of our Blessed Lord (*the Seed*), in that marvellous scene of the Temptation given by the Evangelist, though that attempt was made on the bare suspicion of His Divinity.

The 'seed of the woman,' however, includes all the faithful of every dispensation, more especially, of course, Christians. Between them and Satan there was to be, in virtue of being engrafted on *the Seed*, enmity also. Just as the outward change, if it were so, in the serpent, and the effect of the curse, made him an outward object of enmity to man, reared up feelings of abhorrence and antipathy, so man's natural conscience was to be restored by that engrafting, and placed in an attitude of antipathy to evil. Man under every dispensation,

from the time of the promise till the fulness of the day of Pentecost, has implanted in him anew an antipathy to sin, which it requires a habit to overcome, the first act of sin being always accompanied with some feelings of difficulty; and it is only when, by resisting the conscience, this enmity is got over, that sin becomes really easy, and unaccompanied by remorse. The crushing of the head, with regard to the seed of *the* Seed, means of course that the injuries inflicted by the serpent's seed should be of an inferior kind to those which it should itself incur: *they* should be curable, whereas the injuries inflicted on them should be fatal. *They* should apply to the lower part of man's nature, whereas the injuries inflicted on the seed of the serpent should be in a vital part. There may have been, as I have said, some change in the habits of the serpent after the curse upon him; and if so, they would symbolise this part of the sentence too—the lying in wait for man's heel, and having his own head crushed, answering to the usual case of warfare between animals and man.

The promise is fulfilled, as all God's words

are, completely; and in order to justify it, we must bear in mind what I have just referred to; viz. that deliberate sinners shut themselves out from the woman's seed, and the protection promised to it, and identify themselves with the seed of the serpent, so as to incur the sentence upon him, and forfeit the promise to mankind. Certainly this first reference to man's restoration brings out in very clear relief the exceeding love of God to him. The Fall was indeed a portentous calamity, causing as it did the entrance into the world of death and misery in all its shapes; still, in the sentence pronounced by God we find it implied that, after all, the only great sufferer by it should be the Tempter himself, and those who should voluntarily side with him; that the evil, great as it was, should be turned into an immense benefit for mankind. And in this sense the Church herself sings: 'O certe necessarium Adæ peccatum, quod Christi morte deletum est. O felix culpa, quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem.'<sup>18</sup> St. Anselm also expresses this idea.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Office for Bened. of Paschal Candle on Holy Saturday.

<sup>19</sup> 'D. Why did God allow man to be tempted when He

In the sentence upon Adam and Eve, it is remarkable that no very serious, because no special eternal, penalty is mentioned. In this respect there is a great contrast with the sentence on the serpent. In *his* sentence we can see a deep under-meaning, an eternal doom ; but in the sentence on Adam and Eve it is impossible to detect in the terms any other meaning than the plain temporal one, unless it be the hopeful intimation that even that would not be unmitigated. The sentence on the woman simply relates to her travail in childbirth, and her subjection to her husband. ‘The triple penalty on the woman,’ says the Abbot Rupert, ‘corresponds to her triple sin. For, first, because she believed the serpent when he said, “You shall be as gods,” she is told, “I will multiply thy sorrows and thy conceptions.” Secondly, because from gluttony she ate the forbidden apple, she is told, “In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children ;” and thirdly, because she seduced her husband, she is told, “Thou

---

knew that he would yield? *M.* Because He foreknew what great good He would bring about from his sin.’ (St. Anselm, *Elucidarium.*)

shalt be under thy husband's power, and he shall have dominion over thee." <sup>20</sup> But her travail in childbirth, and her subjection to her husband, grievous and painful as this often is, both seem, under the Christian dispensation, to have been turned into good; the one being the means of her own sanctification and growth in holiness, and the other being consecrated into a sacramental symbol of the union of Christ with His Church, and of her dependence on Him. St. Paul, speaking of this in his first Epistle to Timothy, says: 'Yet she shall be saved through childbearing, if she continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety' <sup>21</sup> — meaning, that childbearing, which at first looked like the woman's curse, should be to her the means of sanctifying herself, if she took the pains accompanying it as a punishment, and lived a Christian life, bringing up her children also 'in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety.' As to the other part of the sentence, which St. Paul alludes to in the twelfth verse of that same chapter, we have only to turn to

<sup>20</sup> Quoted by Cornelius a Lap. *ad loc.*

<sup>21</sup> ii. 15.

another of his Epistles to see that that also has been brightened: 'The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. He is the Saviour of His body. Therefore, as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be subject to their husbands in all things.'

With regard to the sentence upon Adam, we find that there is nothing mentioned but what is outward and temporal. No curse is pronounced upon him, but only on the outward things with which in this mortal life he would have to do: 'Cursed is the earth in thy work; with labour and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat of the herbs of the earth. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the earth, out of which thou wast taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'<sup>22</sup> Previous to the Fall, Adam was put into the Paradise of pleasure, to till the garden and to keep it; and had he not sinned, his bodily labour would have been free from wear and

<sup>22</sup> Gen. iii. 17, 18, 19.

tear. But now, though that labour was to remain of the same kind—for it was to be the keeping and turning to his own use the powers and productions of the world about him—still the sentence upon him mingled toil, trouble, and difficulty with it. What before had been straightforward, easy, and pleasant, was now to be sorrowful and unsatisfactory. All this, however, was but temporal. There was a ‘till’ to the evil—‘till thou return to the earth.’ Beyond that point of time no word of the sentence reaches; whereas the enmity between the woman and the serpent, and her seed and his seed, having no ‘till’ to limit its duration, would protect and save man *after* death.

Observe, then, that though in the warning ‘morte morieris’ there is something more than a temporal death implied—for it is not in a temporal sense that the prophecy was fulfilled; though I say a spiritual death, the death of the soul is implied in the warning—still it does not appear in the subsequent sentence. In fact, the promise that accompanies the sentence on the serpent retracts in some measure the threatened penalty; and so the guileful saying of the

serpent, 'You shalt not die the death,' which he meant to have no truth in it except in a temporal sense, God has turned into a truth of the highest importance to man. Man, no doubt, did die that spiritual death ; for by his sin he lost the grace of God—original justice and integrity—but not irrevocably. God implanted enmity between man and the serpent and the serpent's employer ; and so man had the opportunity of reëstablishing himself in God's favour by living a life of penance, and of faith in that first promise. This was to suffice to keep Satan in check, and to preserve man in a capacity for eternal life till the consummation of the Redemption—till the second Eve should, by her Seed, crush Satan's head.

It is very remarkable, too, that God should have brought about the fulfilment of the other saying of the serpent, 'You shall be as gods,' though in a very different sense from that intended by the serpent's employer. This lying promise our Blessed Lord has made a true one, by another food of life, viz. His own most precious Body and Blood : 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me, and

I in him :’ and thus the great Sacrament fulfils the serpent’s words, making, as it were, divine those who are nourished by it.

A difficulty suggests itself here, and we may as well meet it. It is with regard to the temporal death, which is a part of God’s warning to man, and a main part of the sentence pronounced upon him. It is a difficulty arising from the fact, which science has ascertained, of this temporal death having existed, or of the animal creatures that have lived and died on the earth, previous to man. One cannot but admit the clear proofs given of the fact that whole generations of different orders have lived and died on this earth, and have their remains buried in its strata, before man was created. But there is no real inconsistency here. For what will be the case when death is abolished, and there shall be a new heaven and a new earth? We may gather, I think, from the general tenor of Scripture, that the material framework of the earth will, after its fiery change, be appropriated to some farther use; that it may itself be, under of course altered conditions, the habitation of never-dying men;

and then we shall have just what was meant to be the state of things at Adam's creation. The solid parts of the earth will, perhaps, still bear evidences of the death of God's creatures in a previous dispensation, though death as a reality will be no more. It does not follow because death existed in the world before the creation of Adam, that therefore it was meant to be part of his condition, or of the things around him. The creation of things in Genesis may be analogous in this respect to the one that is to take place at the last day. Man, as appears from Holy Scripture, was created immortal, *potuit non mori* ; and he would not have died at all had he remained faithful, for the tree of life was given him for the very purpose of feeding and nourishing his capacity for not dying : and he would have been in God's own time as we shall be after the Resurrection, the change which was to be made in him not at all implying the dissolution of the body.

## LECTURE IV.

### SACRIFICES OF CAIN AND ABEL. LAMECH.

THE name by which Adam called his wife after the Fall is very significant. 'Eve' means 'living,' נֶחֱמֶה. It is the same word that is used in the sentence, 'Man became a living soul.' That life was now lost through Eve's transgression; yet instead of her bearing a name to mark the entrance of death by her into the world, it is just the reverse. It seems as though Adam, in giving this name to his wife, understood, to a certain extent, the promise, and the curse on the serpent, and had in view the second Eve and her Seed, by whom the head of the serpent was to be crushed, and the restoration to man of that spiritual life by the obedience of Mary, which was lost by the disobedience of Eve. This is the explanation of St. Epiphanius. And the Saint adds: 'that woman

(Mary) justly merited the name of "Mother of all living."<sup>1</sup> It is by reason, then, of *the* Seed, viz. Christ, who was to be born of the Virgin Mary, and was promised to Eve immediately after her sin, that Eve can be called 'Mother of all living.' For, apart from that mystery, she is rather the mother of all the dying. Eve is thus a type of Mary.

The clothing themselves with fig-leaves on the part of Adam and Eve seems to have been the result of an instinct of shame. They perceived that they were naked; and that sense of nakedness must have a special cause and meaning. A new feeling came over them both with the loss of spiritual life; and their passions, which before were in complete subjection to the reason, now rebelled against it. That sense of nakedness, too, took a symbolical expression, intimating, by the looking for outward helps and coverings, the inward need of hiding from the face of God, and of atonement. This idea is confirmed by the fact that the Hebrew word in the Old Testament for atonement is 'a covering.' So that in the provision which God Him-

<sup>1</sup> Vide Corn. & Lap. ad loc.

self made at the Fall for the clothing of Adam and Eve, ordering them to make coats of skins, we can see a clear reference to the necessity of an atonement. The making them, too, implies the slaughter of animals; and inasmuch as no permission to eat the flesh of animals was given until the sacrifice of Noe, that slaughter, ordained by God, must have been sacrificial: so that in this command must be implied the existence of God's ordinance for pleading the future atonement, viz. the rite of sacrifice. The benefits, moreover, of that sacrifice were made more sensible to Adam and Eve by the symbolical and bodily use of the skins of the victims. Just as that lower sense of nakedness was to be satisfied by the ordained clothing of the body, so that inner sense of sin was to be remedied by the clothing upon of Christ, the real sacrifice, 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' and the distinction between the *clothing themselves with leaves*, nature's first suggestion, and *being clothed with skins*, God's ordinance, implying that without shedding of blood there could be no atonement. Here is certainly an instance of the great depth of meaning con-

tained in many of the simple statements of the older books of the Bible. It would be, of course, very immaterial whether Adam and Eve were clothed with this or that particular dress, unless it had such a reference given to it.

The words of God which follow: 'Behold, Adam is become as one of us, knowing good and evil,' are generally explained as uttered ironically. St. Augustine<sup>2</sup> indeed so explains them. They certainly look like irony—an ironical allusion to the Tempter's promise and Eve's expectation. 'Adam,' God seems to say, 'wished by eating of the fruit to become as one of us, but behold how unlike he is to us! He wished to know good and evil, but see the depth of ignorance to which he has sunk!' Mere irony, however, can hardly be the full meaning of the words of God. It does not appear even that they were uttered within Adam's hearing: they were addressed to the Son and Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup> The historian seems to have been inspired by God to put these words on record, in order to convey to future generations

<sup>2</sup> Lib. ii. *De Genes. contra Manich.*

<sup>3</sup> See Cornelius a Lap. ad loc.

the lesson to be learnt from Adam's sin and its punishment, that man was not to dare under any circumstances to assert his own independence, but to respect every word coming from the mouth of God.

The words which follow : ' And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever,' can hardly be intended to mean that there was any risk of man's deriving benefit from eating of the tree of life in spite of God. The virtue, no doubt, remained in the tree,<sup>4</sup> but the outward and visible partaking of the fruit could not have given Adam the benefit originally intended, if God's commands were broken, any more than an act of Communion on the part of a Christian in mortal sin would convey to his soul the benefit of the Sacrament. Rather the reverse. He would increase his sin. So Adam after his sin would not have increased his capacity for immortality by eating of the tree of life, but only have aggravated his state before God : and therefore in mercy as well as in punishment to him God drove him out from Paradise.

<sup>4</sup> See opinion of St. Thomas, given above, Lecture II.

The placing of cherubim and a flaming sword to keep the way of the tree of life shows us, I think, that the Garden of Eden was chiefly to be valued by man as a place of special manifestation of the Divine Presence. That special manifestation was now forbidden him, and he saw at the entrance to Paradise a reminder of the penance due to his sin. Still that very reminder was in itself a Divine manifestation, and a sort of substitute for the more intimate mode of intercourse with God within the garden. And from this point of view we may see that the very means ordained by God to exclude man from Eden, and remind him of his sin and lost privileges, seemed a sort of compensation to him. He was shut out from the sanctuary, as it were, and his altar placed at the entrance to it. It is evident, in any case, from the allusions which continually occur afterwards, that *a* place of God's manifestation was still within man's reach. Cain, *e. g.* 'went out from the presence of the Lord.' He was 'cast out,' just as Adam and Eve were driven from Paradise. The voice of God, too, seems to have been heard as a usual thing by His

worshippers; for it is not stated to have been extraordinary in the case of Cain.

Man, then, still had a manifestation of God, still heard the voice of God after the Fall, and the place of such manifestation was probably the entrance to Paradise guarded by the cherubim. In the doing away of the Mosaic sacrifices, and by the death of Christ, and the institution of the great Christian sacrifice, the Garden of Eden and its special privileges are really restored, and man has once more within reach the tree of life, and the near presence of God, and, moreover, the power of pleading by that presence for the remission of his sin. Our Blessed Lord, too, calls Himself 'the way, the truth, and the life;' in which words there is probably a reference to this barring the way to Eden and the tree of life.

That Adam, after his life of penance, was saved, is of faith;<sup>5</sup> for we read in the Book of Wisdom: 'She (Wisdom) preserved him that was first formed by God the father of the world, when he was created alone; and she brought him out of his sin;'<sup>6</sup> and of course

<sup>5</sup> See Natalis Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* t. i. p. 60.    <sup>6</sup> C. x. 1, 2.

this could only be by his faith in the Redeemer to come. That Eve also benefited by the Redemption then future, Natalis Alexander holds to be beyond a doubt. His words are: 'That our first parents were saved by faith in a future Redeemer is beyond a doubt;'<sup>7</sup> and he gives this as the opinion of St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and St. Leo, who found their view on their interpretation of God's words containing the promise, and the curse on the serpent. The promise was made to *them* (Adam and Eve); therefore they had the opportunity of availing themselves of it; and Eve *probably*, Adam *certainly*, did so. Moreover, part of the curse on the serpent was the enmity that should take place between the woman and her seed on the one hand (and this included Eve, in one sense, primarily), and him and his seed on the other. That enmity was not a natural enmity, it was 'put' by God: so that Eve also had this special help from God to combat the serpent and his seed. She, too, therefore was by God's help to crush the serpent's head.

St. Anselm thinks that Adam and Eve were

<sup>7</sup> t. i. p. 60.

both saved, because we must believe that there never was a moment in which the Redemption was not efficaciously applied to *some* soul. 'It seems unfitting that God should have allowed the human race, and what He did for those from whom the celestial city was to be perfected, to remain even for one moment without purpose. . . . We must not doubt, therefore, but that Adam and Eve attained to that Redemption, although this is not distinctly asserted by Divine authority.'<sup>8</sup>

How long Adam and Eve remained in Paradise before their sin is, of course, uncertain. St. Anselm<sup>9</sup> says only seven hours, and that Eve immediately after her creation began to prevaricate: that at the ninth hour God drove them out of Paradise. But whatever may be said on this point is mere conjecture. That Eve was soon penitent, we can, I think, see from the name she gave her firstborn, Cain, which bears with it an allusion to the promise made to her by God, showing that she was looking forward in faith to a future Redeemer. Cain means 'possession,' and Eve on Cain's

<sup>8</sup> *Cur Deus Homo*, lib. ii. c. xvi.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* c. xiv.

birth said : 'I have gotten a man through God;' as though it were a beginning of the fulfilment of the promise. Abel's name has a very different meaning, and its object is not expressed. It means 'vanity;' as though Eve had associated the promise with her firstborn, and looked on the second as making no addition to her hopes. Cornelius a Lapide thinks that Eve may have had a kind of presentiment of Abel's murder by his brother, or that perhaps she remembered the sentence on herself and posterity as condemned to death, and so called her second son Abel, *i. e.* vanity.

We may gather, I think, from what is stated in the Book of Genesis concerning Cain and Abel, and from the references made to them by the Apostles St. John, St. Paul, and St. Jude, that the remote cause of the bad feeling between the two brothers was the general defect in Cain's life—his not living in and acting on faith in the promise of a future Redeemer; and the proximate cause the envy he entertained at the higher spiritual state of his brother, the one being a natural consequence of the other. Both had had equal spiritual advantages; both

had been taught by Adam the practice of their religious duties, especially of course the rite of Sacrifice,<sup>10</sup> the way, that is, in which it pleased God that men should worship Him; and the general difference between the brothers was that Cain neglected those instructions, whereas Abel observed them. As to the immediate cause of Cain's enmity, which resulted in his becoming a murderer, the Apostle St. John tells us distinctly that it was envy: 'Not as Cain, who was of the wicked one, and killed his brother. And wherefore did he kill him? Because his own works were wicked, and his brother's just.' The general defect, then, in Cain's life, the not living a life of faith, was one main reason no doubt why God 'had no respect' to his sacrifice. That he did in some sort of way acknowledge God and His dominion as Creator, is clear from the fact of his offering a sacrifice at all; and moreover, it would seem, at the appointed place: so that Cain must have had a sort of speculative faith. But his faith was not a living, practical

<sup>10</sup> St. Athanasius, commenting on the words, 'omnia mihi tradita sunt,' says: 'Cain and Abel learned from their father Adam religion and the rite of sacrifice.' (Quoted by Cornelius a Lap.)

faith, based on the Divine tradition from Adam. St. Ambrose explains the rejection of Cain's sacrifice on the ground that he reserved to himself the first-fruits, and only offered of the remainder to God; whereas Abel offered his first-fruits and of the best.<sup>11</sup> That explanation is hardly adequate. St. Paul says, it was 'by faith Abel offered to God a sacrifice exceeding that of Cain, by which he obtained a testimony that he was just, God giving testimony to his gifts.'<sup>12</sup> Of course, by the expression 'by faith,' St. Paul means not merely the inward submission of the intellect to God in the acceptance of His truth, nor even the merely leading a generally pious life, but the acting up to the Divine command, as in other things, so also in the ordinance of sacrifice. Now it was by Abel's faith, in offering the *prescribed* victim in sacrifice, that he 'obtained testimony that he was just;' and by Cain's not doing so, that he was rejected.

All nations from the beginning, even those

<sup>11</sup> 'Obtulit a fructibus terræ, non a primis fructibus primitias Deo. Hoc est primitias sibi prius vendicare, Deo autem sequentia deferre.' (Lib. i. *De Caino et Abel*, cc. 7, 10, quoted by Cornelius a Lap.)

<sup>12</sup> Heb. xi. 4.

who have lapsed into utter barbarism, have universally believed that man, having sinned, has to make expiation for his sin to God by suffering, by death, by *bloodshedding*. Consequently they ever had their sacrifices, in which the blood of the victim was shed. Now 'every custom that is universal is *original*, more particularly when it does not occur naturally to the mind ; for it is inconceivable that men separated and divided off from one another should have come to an understanding about, or chanced to hit upon, such a custom ; and we must go back to the time when there was yet but one single family, to find the source of what they hold in common. It is not chance or a blind instinct that has produced this effect ; it is the primitive unity of religion, together with unity of origin. The whole world was at first well taught in its fathers and founders. The truth exists before untruth, for untruth is but the truth changed. Every error presupposes, then, a truth, and every universal error a grand primitive and original truth.<sup>18</sup> That original truth unquestion-

<sup>18</sup> Nicolas, *Etudes phil. sur le Christianisme*, tom. ii. p. 59.

ably was, that 'without shedding of blood there is no remission;' and the original rite of sacrifice included that bloodshedding. And ever after, through the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations; we find this acted on, and by Divine command. The appointed sacrifice in expiation for sin was either a lamb, or a bullock, or a heifer, whose blood was shed; the value, of course, of all such sacrifices consisting in their being shadows of the one great expiatory Sacrifice on the Cross; to keep before men's minds the salvation to come, and to anticipate its effects. The Abbot Rupert, commenting on the passage of St. Paul to the Hebrews given above, after stating that the cause of the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice, and the rejection of Cain's, was the inward disposition of each, goes on to explain the words *per fidem Abel obtulit*; and the explanation he gives clearly shows that he considered there was an *outward* character in Abel's sacrifice which rendered him acceptable to God, viz. its typifying the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist. 'Because, in truth, the sacrifice which our High-Priest Jesus Christ instituted on that night, though in outward appearance

bread and wine, is in reality the Lamb of God, the first-born of all lambs and sheep which belong to the sheepfold of heaven, the pastures of Paradise.' And so it typified also the great bloodshedding on the Cross, of which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is but the perpetuation.

'The requirements of the law of sacrifice,' says M. Nicolas,<sup>14</sup> 'in this respect' (that is, the shedding of blood) 'appear in the very first sacrifices of which mention is made in history; the sacrifices of Cain and Abel. Cain, a tiller of the ground, offers to God *of the fruits of the earth*. Abel, who was a shepherd, offers of the first-born of his flock, and of the fattest. "And the Lord," we read 'in Genesis, "had respect to Abel and his offerings; but to Cain and his offerings he had no respect." Whence is this? "It is because," says a Father of the Church, St. Clement, "because Cain had sinned in the choice of his offering." And yet that offering was in keeping with his profession of tiller of the ground; just as that of Abel was with his profession of shepherd. The worth of the offering, then, was relatively the same.' M. Nicolas

<sup>14</sup> *Etudes phil. sur le Christianisme*, t. ii. p. 69.

goes on to quote the author of the *Explication de la Genèse* to the same effect: 'There is nothing in the sacrifice offered by Cain which can lead one to conjecture that he looked on himself as a sinner, as condemned to death, as having need of a victim that should take his place before God, and be immolated for him. What he offers is compatible with the state of an innocent man; the fruits of the earth, signs of gratitude, proofs that he looks on God as the Author of temporal goods. But there is nothing in his sacrifice which relates to the Mediator, nothing gives one the idea of it, nothing helps towards the remembrance of it.'<sup>15</sup> I think, then, we may say, that the rejection of Cain's sacrifice was due first to the fact that he was not a true worshipper in his heart, and then, and equally, because he did not offer the appointed victim that was to shadow forth the true Victim for the sins of the world.

One cannot help remarking here how very intimate the intercourse between God and man still was after the Fall. Though cast out of

<sup>15</sup> M. Nicolas, *Etudes phil. sur le Christianisme*, l. ii. c. iv., *Etudes sur les Sacrifices*.

Eden, he had not entirely lost one of his greatest privileges, that of hearing the voice of God and receiving direct communication from him. The familiarity between God and Cain and Abel seems to be quite as close as it was between God and Adam. The Fall, then, did not entirely break that Communion. What did sever it was the subsequent wickedness of mankind. As in the case of Cain, a wilful crime lost him the privilege of that near presence of God which the original sin had not. But as yet man had very close and constant intercourse with God ; so constant that it seems nothing could be done in the way of religious observance without His direction for it. Immediately, too, on sacrifice being offered, there was a sensible sign of God's acceptance or otherwise ; and a voice from God was so usual that no surprise or change in ordinary feeling was caused by it.

The expostulation of God with Cain upon the rejection of his sacrifice is a difficult passage : ' If thou do well, shalt thou not receive ? but if ill, shall not sin forthwith be present at the door ? but the lust thereof shall be under

thee, and thou shalt have dominion over it.<sup>16</sup> This has been understood in various ways. It is certain that the dominion here spoken of does not refer to Abel. St. Chrysostom is the only Father who holds that it does. The whole consensus of the Fathers is against him.<sup>17</sup> St. Ambrose<sup>18</sup> and St. Augustine<sup>19</sup> both maintain that, as there is no mention here at all of Abel, the reference in the pronoun is to the *sin*. The meaning of the passage, according to St. Chrysostom, whom, by the way, Calvin in this has followed, is, that Cain, if he did well, would not forfeit his precedence over Abel. That cannot be the meaning of it. The expression, 'the lust thereof shall be under thee,' is just analogous to God's words to Eve—'thou shalt be under thy husband's power, and he shall rule over thee.' Now the authority of a first-born over the other children scarcely amounts to the same sort of thing as the authority of a husband over a wife. It is a precedence, and has (at least in the Old Testament) certain priestly and patriarchal privileges; but it was not one

<sup>16</sup> Gen. iv. 7.

<sup>17</sup> See Corn. a Lap. *ad loc.*

<sup>18</sup> Lib. ii. *De Caino et Abel.*

<sup>19</sup> Lib. xv. *De Civ. Dei.*

of personal command and obedience. It nowhere appears to be a Divine precept, that the younger brothers should obey the elder. Yet that would be necessary if we took the words in the sense of St. Chrysostom. The obedience of the younger brother to the elder would be as much a Divine precept as that of the wife to the husband. It does not refer, then, to Abel, but to the sin, and more particularly the penalty for sin. The penalty for sin is personified, and so in fact the expression, 'shall not sin forthwith be present at the door?' implies. The word for 'is present' here is the word used for an animal crouching. It implies the resting position of a beast or bird, as in Isaiah xi. 6, 'the leopard shall lie down with kid.' The penalty for sin, then, is here spoken of figuratively as a beast crouching at the door; and the meaning of the passage is, that if Cain did well, there was no need for him to be cast down, 'shalt thou not be received?' and if he did not well, sin had gained an advantage over him, and the penalty for the sin was lying at his door like a beast of prey. Yet there was no reason why his sin *should* overcome him, for it was

not to have dominion over him. The designs of sin should be under his control, and he should, if he chose, get the better of it.<sup>20</sup>

The voice of God to Cain after the commission of the murder shows still more strongly how familiar this Divine intercourse with man was. He could meet the question from God Himself with a lie, his conscience, being hardened by the commission of the crime. 'I know not,' he says; and moreover he taunts God with the supposition that he had charge of his brother. There is evidently great depth of meaning in God's answer to Cain: 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to Me from the earth.' The shedding of blood was, as we have seen, at the time of this murder, entirely a religious act; and it is precisely this fact which gives to the shedding of human blood its awful character. It was a 'crying unto God;' an appeal to God of the most solemn kind, pointing forward, by its expiatory character, to the great shedding of Blood on the Cross, and so pleading the great Atonement. Thus the shedding of human

<sup>20</sup> This is the explanation of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, Hugo, the Ven. Bede, Alcuin, Eucharis, and Cardinal Bellarmine. (Vide Corn. à Lap. *ad loc.*)

blood was an awful desecration of a religious ordinance, and, as viewed from God's side, placed in the most direct inconsistency the pleading of the Atonement, and the wilful sin which could not be atoned so long as it remained wilful.

There seems to be a consensus of the Fathers as to the meaning of Cain's reply to God. Athanasius<sup>21</sup> *ad Antiochenses*, qu. 96, thinks they mean 'my punishment is greater than I can bear.' But the whole stream of Latin and Greek Fathers is against him. They translate, together with the LXX. and the Chaldee version, 'my sin is greater than that I may deserve pardon.' And so the Vulgate. The saying, in fact, expressed an act of despair on the part of Cain. He felt himself an outcast on the earth, and a fugitive after the curse had been pronounced on him: he knew that he should have

<sup>21</sup> This is not St. Athanasius of Alexandria; for in this book of questions the author quotes St. Epiphanius and St. Gregory of Nyssen, who lived at a later period than St. Athanasius; nay, the author quotes St. Athanasius himself only to differ from him; nor is it St. Athanasius of Nicæa, who wrote at considerable length on the Holy Scriptures; though probably both these authors penned their writings at Antioch.

no resting-place; that men would flee from him and he from them; and, with the dread of bodily death<sup>22</sup> before him, he almost entreats God's protection: 'Behold, Thou hast cast me out this day from the face of the earth, and I shall be hidden from Thy face, and I shall be a vagabond and a fugitive on the earth: every one therefore that findeth me shall kill me.' But it was not in the designs of God that Cain should be slain; and therefore He set a mark upon him, that every one might know and avoid him. Some have thought this mark to have been merely terror in his conscience: but all the Fathers agree in considering it an outward visible mark, a trembling of the whole body, and a fearful expression of countenance. God's object in placing this mark upon Cain was to hold him up to universal execration as the first murderer, the first desecrator of a religious ordinance. He was to be an example to others, and therefore, so far, was to have God's protection; to avert from him that punishment at the hands of his fellow-men which natural

<sup>22</sup> St. Ambrose (*De Caino et Abel*) says: 'Cain impoenitens timet mortem corporis, non animæ.'

instinct would have inflicted. 'And the Lord said to him: No, it shall not be so: but whosoever shall kill Cain shall be punished sevenfold.' The meaning of which is: whosoever shall kill Cain shall be punished still more grievously; for he will be the second murderer, who did not benefit by the example of Cain's punishment. That God's protection was in this way extended over Cain must have been notorious from its being referred to by Lamech five generations afterwards: 'sevenfold vengeance shall be taken for Cain, but Lamech seventy times sevenfold.'

A part of Cain's descendants are mentioned here,<sup>28</sup> probably on account of their inventions, and their importance, therefore, to the history of mankind. Otherwise we should not have supposed that they would have been referred to. Of course, in regard to genealogies generally, we must not consider them as complete accounts of the multiplication of mankind. They are simply selections from those lines which had some important bearing on mankind at large. Just one particular line of Cain's is mentioned.

<sup>28</sup> Gen. iv. 17, and following verses.

In Adam's case, only Seth and his descendants are particularised, though of course there were other children: indeed, it is stated that 'he begat sons and daughters.' And so of other patriarchal genealogies. The names given are those essential to trace down a particular branch.

The city mentioned in the fourth chapter as built by Cain was the first city in the world. The date of its foundation was, of course, many years subsequently, perhaps 400 or 500; as Cain had then descendants in sufficient number to people it. He probably built it for his own greater safety, living as he was under the continual fear of being slain.<sup>24</sup>

The saying of Lamech to which I referred just now is a difficult passage. Archbishop Martini gives, perhaps, the best explanation of it: 'Who the man was that was slain by Lamech it is impossible to say with any certainty. The Jews, following their tradition, quoted by St. Jerome, say that Lamech had accidentally killed Cain, and that he is speaking to his wives of that fact, saying that they need not fear on

<sup>24</sup> Archp. Martini, note *ad loc.*

that account that any evil should happen to him ; because if the murderer of Cain was threatened so severe and rigorous a punishment, much more severe would be the penalty visited on him who should slay Lamech. For Lamech, it is supposed, had not voluntarily but accidentally killed Cain. In this case, then, we must observe that the "man" of the first part of the verse (23d) is the same person as the "stripling" of the second part—a mode of repetition frequently used in Scripture. But who can believe that a man like Cain should be called a "stripling"? On the strength, therefore, of the same Jewish tradition, it is farther said that Lamech had killed both Cain *and* a stripling, who through a mistake had been the cause of the first homicide. But in that case there would be two homicides, and we could not understand how Lamech could be, or pretend to be, more privileged than Cain. If I might dare to give my own opinion on so difficult a passage, I should translate this verse thus: "I have slain a man to my own detriment, and a youth to wound myself;" and this translation, which agrees with the LXX. version,

fits in too with the following verse, which illustrates it: "I have," says Lamech, "slain a man to my own detriment, by my great misfortune doing more injury to myself than to him; for if the punishment inflicted on Cain was severe, that inflicted on me will be much more terrible." The only thing that appears certain from the words of Scripture here is, that Lamech had actually committed a murder, and that he feared a much more terrible punishment for it than befell Cain. It is impossible to understand the statement figuratively. To do so would be to go against the very first principles of Hermeneutics, which is, that the words of Scripture are to be taken in a literal sense, unless some good reason can be given for not doing so. Lamech, it is clear, was anything but a religious man. He was the first to set at naught the original institution of marriage by taking two wives; and it is quite conceivable that, after the commission of such a sin, he should have been led into quarrels and disputes, which ended in his committing murder.

## LECTURE V.

### EARLY USE OF THE WORD 'JEHOVAH.' HENOCH.

THE expression in Gen. iv. 26, 'This man began to call upon the name of Jehovah,' seems to refer to the distinction between Seth and his descendants, and the rest of Adam's family. It cannot, of course, mean that then, for the first time, Enos began to pray to God, because both Adam and Seth must have done that. What began with Enos clearly was, the distinction between Seth's descendants and the Cainites. This man Enos, then, first began to assemble the people for the public worship of God. Then began the distinctive term 'sons of God,' or 'people of God,' in contradistinction to the term 'sons of men,' the descendants of Cain, to whom allusion is made in the first verse of the sixth chapter. This verse, as compared with Exod. vi. 3, is supposed by writers

of the rationalistic school to present a contradiction, and so afford ground for denying the veracity at least of the Book of Genesis. It forms one of Dr. Colenso's main objections.

'This man began to call upon the name of Jehovah' (Gen. iv. 26); and in Exod. vi. 3: 'And God spake unto Moses, and said to him, I am Jehovah (יהוה); and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty (אלהים); but by My name Jehovah was I not known to them.' This is supposed to be the contradiction, that whereas in the passage of Exodus Moses makes God say that His name Jehovah was not known before even to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we yet find that name continually in the mouths of those patriarchs, and once in that of Eve.

Many explanations have been given of this seeming contradiction. Some have supposed Moses to have been speaking simply as an historian, and putting into the mouths of the Patriarchs and others a name of God familiar in his own day; others, that a greater fulness of knowledge was now conveyed of the name Jehovah. Dr. Laing, however, seems to have

given the best, because the most consistent, explanation, in his essay published in the volume edited by the Archbishop of Westminster.<sup>1</sup> The name El Shaddai was a *covenant* name, and given as such by God Himself to the Patriarchs. Now the covenant name is to be Jehovah, and is *officially* announced as such. 'By a covenant name of God,' says Dr. Laing, 'I understand, of course, the name by which He is officially declared in the covenant. In all human covenants, the likeness of which is observed throughout the Divine transactions with men, there are not only parties—promises on one side, obligations on the other, and a sign in making the agreement—but besides these a *name*, by which the promising party is to be designated, and to be held responsible for its due performance. Thus with the Christian covenant, not merely does the human side in baptism receive a new name, but God Himself has edited a new name, under which He promises to the other party everlasting life, which is the title of 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' This is the name under which He

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on Religion and Literature.*

would be appealed to, and held bound in honour for His promises being performed. This is, therefore, the name in which all other treaties between God and the Christian are signed and sealed—the name with which the Christian habitually arms himself, as with a pledge of faith and hope; and this name occupies in the Christian covenant the same position which El Shaddai did before, and, as we are affirming, Jehovah did afterwards.”<sup>2</sup> And a little farther on Dr. Laing paraphrases the passage in Exodus, in order to bring out the special meaning of the clause, ‘was not made known.’ ‘And God spake to Moses, when preparing to deliver the people from their slavery in Egypt, and to bring them out for His own people, “I am Jehovah. Such is the title under which I now intend to have Myself called in that alliance in which I am going to employ you, Moses, as My chief hand or minister: not as I chose to be called before in the covenant work or part to which I called your fathers the Patriarchs. For in My covenant with *them*

<sup>2</sup> First promulgation of the name Jehovah. (*Essays on Religion and Literature*, p. 179.)

I appeared, or was seen, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, under the title of El Shaddai—God Almighty. Such was the title under which I subscribed My name to pledge Myself to perform what I promised. But under the name which I have just announced to you—the name Jehovah—did I not make Myself known to them, as by My official name. And, accordingly, I established with them My Covenant, which was not an instituted form of national worship, but such an one as was meet for them as the progenitors of the Holy Seed, and prospectively inheritors of the land, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, in which they were strangers; a covenant preparatory to the one I am about to make with you, which is to make you a people ordained to the charge of worshipping Me, with a national service arranged for that purpose, under a name more proper than the name El Shaddai for perpetual worship—the name Jehovah, or self-existent Being—the Being of beings. With this intent as I vouchsafed to have respect to your fathers, so now I have heard the groaning of the children of Israel,

whom the Egyptians are holding in bondage, and I have remembered My covenant, in which I promised that the seed of Abraham should inherit the land of Canaan. Wherefore, in pursuance of this intention of performing My promise, I give to the children of Israel My newly-announced name as a pledge, under which I will be bound to do what I say, and say to them, 'I am Jehovah;' and I will bring you out from under the burden of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great judgments; and with the purpose of bringing about your inheritance of the land, and your being made the covenant people, I will take you to Me for a people, such as you have not been before, except in destination and promise—a people to worship Me—a holy people—a people of priests; and I will be to you, in a more manifest manner than during your captivity, a God—not as of the Hebrews only, but God of Israel—the national God; and you shall know Me, own Me, have My name recorded amongst you as God of Israel, different from the nations about you—Moab and Ammon

and Egypt, whose adopted gods are false ; and you shall know that I Jehovah, to be henceforth cited and worshipped by you under that title for ever, am your God, who bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And this name shall be a standard, under which I will have you, Moses, to conduct the redemption of them into the land of safety which I swore to give to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob ; and I will give it to you, their representatives, for a heritage. This is My Covenant ; and as assurance of its certainty, behold, I pledge the honour of My name—I Jehovah.” The sense, then, of the passage in Exodus is, that though the name *Jehovah* was known before both to the Patriarchs and even to Eve, still it was not known to them as the Covenant name. Now God Himself officially announces it as the Covenant name, by which He binds Himself to the performance of His promise, viz. the redemption of Israel from bondage, and the constituting them His own peculiar people. Thus all appearance of contradiction between the two passages disappears.

The author of *Bible Difficulties* has some

remarks on the seeming contradiction, which are well worth quoting here. He appears to agree with Dr. Laing as to the name *Jehovah* being the covenant name, the name by which God pledged Himself to the performance of His promise; but maintains that this is evident from the force of the word *Jehovah* itself: 'In reality it (the seeming contradiction) has been caused by a misunderstanding of the Hebrew original, and when this is correctly translated disappears. . . . It is in that chapter (Exod. iii.) that God is declared to have promised redemption from its bondage to Israel, and commissioned Moses, as His instrument, to carry this promise into effect. Moses is then said to have asked by what name he shall announce this promise, and his commission to the people. To this no direct answer is vouchsafed; because it is revealed to man, not by a special designation, but by the attribute under which He is at the time manifesting His power. The redemption of Israel is the particular operation now proposed. Hence, waving the question of name, but appealing to the future fulfilment of the

promise now given, as an evidence to succeeding generations of men that this was to be the work of God, He said to Moses, not "I am that I am" (as St. Paul was well aware when he—otherwise most presumptuously—used a similar form of words of himself in 1 Cor. xv. 10,) but "I shall it cause to be," "I who cause to be." And then added, "I shall cause to be hath sent me unto you;" that is to say, "I who shall cause the redemption (which I now promise to my people) to be."

'In order to understand the full force of this emphatic declaration, it is essential to remember that the Israelites were chosen by God to illustrate His dealings with men, and this in despite of the ungrateful return men usually make for benefits conferred—even to God. Hence the history of the Jewish nation furnishes at once an example and a warning to their Christian (divinely chosen) supplanters. The actions it records are, moreover, symbolical lessons as well as actual events. . . . When this symbolic character of the important acts recorded in Holy Writ is fully grasped, the reader will perceive that the redemption of the enslaved Jews from ma-

terial bondage prefigured, or prophesied in action, the redemption of fallen man from spiritual bondage, which was to follow. It is only from this point of view that the comprehensive character of the promise—the real nature of the declaration made by God to Moses—can be clearly grasped. When redemption was first promised to man, the promise, although explicit as to act, was figurative and indefinite as to personality, time, and circumstance. . . . But even here no mention is made of who the redeemer will be that God will raise up. Now, however, the time has come for the lifting of this veil, and therefore in the declaration, “I will cause redemption to be,” God reveals that He is to be Himself this so long-promised redeemer—that He will work out the salvation of His people. It is in the light of this revelation that *Exod. vi. 3* should be read. This passage does not, as is commonly supposed, contain the communication of the name “Jehovah” to man; this had been known long before. What was not hitherto known by man was that “Jehovah,” who had created and still sustained the world, would also Himself redeem fallen man. This

knowledge it is that is now imparted, and with it a new, a hitherto unknown, meaning is stamped upon the word. Hence the reading should be, not "by my name Jehovah," but "by my office of redeemer," was I not known to them, "name" here standing for "office" or "function," as it invariably does in Hebrew, and "Jehovah" representing the act to affirm which it is applied.<sup>3</sup>

It is expressly stated in the fourth verse of the fifth chapter that besides Cain and Seth, the only two children of Adam mentioned, that Adam begat sons and daughters, though how many we do not know : and here, as throughout the genealogies of the Bible, the race which is specified and genealogically recorded has reference to the Messias, no parts of the family being mentioned which were not essentially connected with the chosen Seed. The fifth chapter contains the genealogy of the race of Seth. In regard to the chronology of it, there is a doubt whether the Hebrew text be the correct one, as there is a great difference between the Hebrew, Septuagint, and Samaritan versions, the Sa-

<sup>3</sup> *Bible Difficulties*, p. 240.

maritan making the interval between the Creation and the Deluge the shortest, 1307 years; the Septuagint\* the longest, 2242 years; and the Hebrew, 1656 years. Inaccuracy in numerals would, of course, be more easily accounted for than in many other parts of the text, because they would be represented by characters, and the omission or addition of a stroke might make a very great difference in the reckoning. The LXX. add one hundred years to the age of most of the Patriarchs at the time of the birth of most of their sons. After the Deluge the difference becomes still greater, so as to make seven or eight hundred years' difference between the Deluge and the call of Abraham, the LXX. making that interval the longest. We are not called upon to decide on the comparative authority of the Hebrew and Septuagint chronology. Indeed, the question is hardly to be solved. As it lies quite beyond the field of faith and morals, the Church, having given no decision on the point, leaves us free to take which view may seem best to us.

Both St. Jerome and St. Augustine consider the whole inquiry a useless one. The former

says: 'What end is gained by clinging to the letter, and finding fault with an error of the writer, or the number of years,\* when it is very clearly written, "the letter killeth; but the spirit giveth life." Read through all the books of the Old and New Testaments, and you will find so great a discrepancy in the years, and the number between Judah and Israel, *i. e.* between both kingdoms, so confused, that to pry into questions of this kind would seem to be rather the occupation of an idle man than of a student;'<sup>4</sup> and St. Augustine: 'Where numbers are of no importance in a matter which can be easily understood, or which it may seem useful to learn, they are carelessly written, and still more carelessly corrected. For who can think that he must learn how many thousand men were contained in each of the tribes of Israel? Because it is not considered of any importance; and how very few men think it of any importance.'<sup>5</sup>

There can be no doubt the Church formerly

<sup>4</sup> Ep. 132, *ad Vitalem*, quoted by Natalis Alex. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xv. c. xiii.

adopted the Septuagint chronology, and not that of the Hebrew text ;<sup>6</sup> but from the fact of her declaring the Vulgate, which is translated from the Hebrew, as authoritative, she allows us to receive its chronology, so far as we can prove it to be correct. The three possible chronologies, however, of the Bible are so conflicting that most Biblical scholars have simply abandoned all hope of reconciling them. Natalis Alexander has a long chapter in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* in defence of the Hebrew chronology, basing his argument mainly on the fact that St. Jerome and St. Augustine follow it, both of whom were well acquainted with Hebrew, whereas those quoted as supporting the claims of the LXX. (and they are numerous) were utterly ignorant of it ; and the curious on such points would do well to consult him. But we must make no mistake as to their value. Men like Dr. Colenso, Renan, Strauss, Shenkel, and others, who stake their salvation on the Protestant principle of the individual critical reason being man's guide to heaven, may stand aghast in presence of such difficulties : they

<sup>6</sup> Nat. Alex. *Hist. Eccles.* t. i. p. 78.

may fear, as some one quaintly remarked, 'lest Christianity should go to the dogs because the hare does or does not chew the cud;' but the Catholic, with the perpetual voice of the Church of God speaking to him, can afford to treat all such questions as more than puerile, unless studied by the light of that Church's teaching.

The mention of Enoch in this fifth chapter is remarkable, and is another instance of the brevity of the older parts of the Bible: 'Enoch walked with God, and was seen no more, because God took him.'<sup>7</sup> The 'walking with God' is, of course, walking by God's rule, leading a practical highly-religious life, and consequently enjoying close communion with God on earth: as is said of Noe in c. vi. 9, and to Abraham by God in xvii. 1. The expression, 'was seen no more,' implies his removal from the earth in some way. But we certainly should never have discovered the important fact of his translation in the flesh without some farther help than those words by themselves afford. Throughout the rest of the Old Testament writings there is no clear statement of it.

<sup>7</sup> v. 24.

The passage in Ecclesiasticus<sup>8</sup> speaks of the translation of Enoch into Paradise, but whether by death or otherwise it is not stated; nor do we know from the words used whether by 'Paradise' is meant Heaven, or not. We owe our certain knowledge of the real case entirely to the words of St. Paul, who gives an explanation of it in his Epistle to the Hebrews: 'By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and he was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had testimony that he pleased God.'<sup>9</sup> The knowledge of the fact, however, was preserved traditionally among God's people, and the truth of the tradition is confirmed by an inspired writer. Enoch, then, is still living, and in the flesh. The question as to his precise abode is one about which the Fathers have held different opinions: and most legitimately; for, as St. Vincent of Lerins says, 'the ancient consent of the Fathers is not to be sought in every petty question concerning the Divine law, but only in the rule of Faith.' St. Thomas<sup>10</sup> thinks

<sup>8</sup> C. xlv. 17: 'Enoch placuit Deo, et translatus est in Paradisum, ut det gentibus poenitentiam.'

<sup>9</sup> Heb. xi. 5.

<sup>10</sup> In Ep. St. Pauli ad Heb. xi. 5.

that both Henoch and Elias dwell in the earthly Paradise, the garden of Eden. This is also the opinion of St. Irenæus. Speaking of the translation of Henoch and Elias, the Saint says that they are now 'where the first man was placed, viz. in Paradise; as the Scripture says: "And God planted a Paradise in Eden to the east, and placed there the man whom He had formed:" and whence he was driven for his disobedience into this world. Wherefore the Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, say, that those who have been translated have been translated there. For a Paradise is prepared for just men, and those who have the Spirit, to which the Apostle Paul, being carried, heard words unutterable to us in our present state; and there those who have been translated remain until the consummation (of all things), looking forward to incorruption.'<sup>11</sup> St. Athanasius,<sup>12</sup> St. Isidore,<sup>13</sup> St. Justin Martyr,<sup>14</sup> all hold this opinion. And the passage above given

<sup>11</sup> *Adv. Hæreses*, c. v.

<sup>12</sup> *Ep. de Syn. Nic. contra Arianam hæresim.*

<sup>13</sup> *De Vita et Obitu Sanctorum*, c. iii.

<sup>14</sup> In the work ascribed to him, *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos.*

from Ecclesiasticus would seem at first sight to favour it. But with St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory, even we may venture to hold a different view. In the first place, it is more than probable that the garden of Eden was utterly destroyed by the Deluge. It is conceivable, of course, that God should have preserved it during that awful cataclysm. But we know not that He did so. On the contrary, the words of Scripture seem quite conclusive in favour of the Deluge having been universal, and consequently of its having devastated the whole face of the earth, including the garden of Eden. We read in Gen. vii.: ‘ And the flood was forty days upon the earth, and the waters increased, and lifted up the Ark on high from the earth. And they overflowed exceedingly, and filled all the face of the earth . . . and the waters prevailed beyond measure upon the earth, and all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it covered.’ Notwithstanding, therefore, the theory of a *partial* Deluge, which many scientific men have held, and which we shall discuss in our next lecture, we cannot come to

any other conclusion but this, that the Deluge quite destroyed all vestige of the garden of Eden, and that consequently that cannot be the present abode of Henoch and Elias. 'To attempt to except it from that general catastrophe,' says Natalis Alexander,<sup>15</sup> 'would be to play a dangerous experiment with the plain words of Scripture, and give a handle to infidelity in its evasion of the force of Scripture generally.' 'Besides,' he adds, 'if the waters of the Deluge did not touch Paradise, Noe could have been preserved there, with his family and the animals. Where, then, would have been the need for building so vast an Ark?'<sup>16</sup> St. Augustine looks on the question as one of those on which we are, *salvâ Catholicâ fide*, at liberty to hold our own opinion: 'Very different are those questions which, it is held, are outside the domain of Faith, from those in which, saving always our faith as Christians, either it is not known what is true, and a definite opinion suspended, or weak human conjecture hazards an opinion at variance with the real case. For instance, when it is asked what is the nature

<sup>15</sup> *Ad loc.*<sup>16</sup> *Hist. Eccl. t. i. p. 44.*

and the site of Paradise, in which God placed man, whom He formed of the dust; though Christian faith does not doubt that that Paradise exists: or when it is asked where are now Elias and Enoch, whether in that spot or elsewhere? though we do not doubt that they are living in the bodies in which they were born . . . . . who does not perceive in these questions and innumerable others of a like nature, which belong either to the most hidden works of God, or to the most secret depths of Scripture, which it is most difficult to understand completely and define—both that many things are unknown to us without detriment to our Christian faith, and that error may creep in at some point without our incurring the crime of heretical dogmatism?<sup>17</sup> It is evident, then, that St. Augustine, though he seems to have believed, from this passage, in the existence of the garden of Eden, did not consider it as the abode of Enoch and Elias. Nay, from another passage, in the *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xv. c. 27, we may argue that the Saint believed in the universality of the Deluge, and consequently

<sup>17</sup> *De Peccato Originali*, lib. ii. c. 23.

in the destruction of the garden of Eden. He says that the whole of the mountains of the earth were covered and devastated by the Deluge.

St. Gregory the Great,<sup>18</sup> speaking of the ascension of Elias, mentions also the translation of Henoch. He considers that Henoch was, like Elias, raised up to the third heaven, *cælum aereum*, thence to be placed in some secret corner of the earth. Natalis Alexander quotes a long passage from the Saint's Homily, concluding: 'If St. Gregory had believed with certainty that Henoch had been translated to the earthly Paradise, he would certainly, having so good an opportunity, have mentioned it here.'

Of the passage in Ecclesiasticus above quoted, we may observe, that it is by no means necessary to take the word 'Paradise' as meaning the garden of Eden, in which Adam was placed at his creation. It might be some other spot, chosen by God: a place of delights, no doubt, in which Henoch was to live in the flesh, until, at the end of the world, he should come with Elias to preach penance to the na-

<sup>18</sup> Hom. xxix. in Evang.

tions—but not necessarily the earthly Paradise. Scripture often employs the word ‘Paradise’ to express the idea of any place of pleasure: *e.g.* Gen. xiii. 10, where the whole region watered by the Jordan is called ‘Paradisus Domini.’ And in the Canticle of Canticles (iv. 18): ‘Thy plants are a paradise of pomegranates, with the fruits of the orchard.’

Before leaving this point we will give the words of St. Chrysostom that refer to this and similar questions: ‘And therefore, because he (Enoch) pleased Him much, He translated him. But should any one, with somewhat of curiosity, ask, “To what place did He translate him?” and “Does he still live?” let him learn that it is not fitting to follow out human thoughts, and to explore over-curiously the things which are of God; but to believe those things which are said.’

It is, then, utterly improbable that Enoch and Elias are now in the garden of Eden, for the reasons above given. All that we know, whether from Scripture or tradition, is, that they are alive and in the flesh. In what particular spot, is one of the hidden secrets of

God, which will not be made known to man until the consummation of all things.

It is remarkable that another tradition respecting Enoch has been similarly preserved, and confirmed by an Apostle of our Lord. I mean his prophecy, given by St. Jude 14, 15: 'Now of these Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with thousands of His Saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to reprove all the ungodly for all the works of their ungodliness, whereby they have done ungodly, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against God.' There is a question whether Enoch committed this writing to prophecy or not. Many of the Fathers hold that he did. The probability, however, is, that Enoch merely uttered this prophecy, and did not commit to writing. In the first place, St. Jude states only that Enoch prophesied. Secondly, if he *had* written it, it is more than probable that later writers—Moses, for instance—would have quoted it. Thirdly, the Jews would not have omitted it from their Canon. Fourthly, the providence of God would hardly have allowed

so important a book to perish. Fifthly, Moses is acknowledged to have been the inventor of the written characters : he delivered them to the Jews, from whom the Phœnicians learnt them, and transmitted them to the Greeks. Enoch, therefore, could not have committed his prophecy to writing.<sup>19</sup>

These two statements concerning Enoch, viz. his translation, and his having prophesied of our Blessed Lord, are clear instances of the extra-scriptural knowledge of Divine truth possessed by God's people at all times, which was transmitted by Divine tradition from generation to generation.

<sup>19</sup> Natalis Alex. *Hist. Eccl.* t. i. p. 67.

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON:

ROBSON AND SONS, PRINTERS, PANCRAS ROAD, N.W.





# A Select Catalogue of Books

PUBLISHED BY

BURNS, OATES, & CO.,

17 & 18, PORTMAN STREET,

AND

63, PATERNOSTER ROW.



## BOOKS LATELY PUBLISHED

BY MESSRS.

### BURNS, OATES, & CO.,

17 & 18, Portman Street, and 63, Paternoster Row.

---

*Memorials of those who Suffered for the*  
Faith in Ireland in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth,  
and Eighteenth Centuries. Collected from Au-  
thentic and Original Documents by MYLES  
O'REILLY, B.A., LL.D. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

"A very valuable compendium of the martyrology of Ireland during the three, or rather two, centuries of active Protestant persecution. The language of many of these original records, written often by a friend or relative of the martyr, is inexpressibly touching, often quite heroic in its tone."—*Dublin Review*

"Very interesting memories."—*Montb.*

---

*Life of St. Thomas of Canterbury.* By  
Mrs. HOPE, Author of "The Early Martyrs"  
Cloth extra, 4s. 6d.

A valuable addition to the collection of historical books for Catholic readers. It contains a large collection of interesting facts, gleaned with great

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

industry from the various existing Lives of St. Thomas, and other documents.

"Compiled with great care from the best authors."—*Month*.

"The rich covers of this splendidly-bound volume do not, as is often the case, envelop matter unworthy of its fair exterior. This is a volume which will be found useful as a present, whether in the college or school, for either sex."—*Weekly Register*.

"An agreeable and useful volume."—*Nation*.

"A more complete collection of incidents and anecdotes, combined with events of greater weight, could not be compressed into so compact, yet perfectly roomy, a space."—*Tablet*.

By the same Author.

*Life of St. Philip Neri.* New Edition.  
2s. 6d.; cheap edition, 2s.

#### NARRATIVE OF MISSIONS.

*The Corean Martyrs.* By Canon SHORTLAND. Cloth, 2s.

A narrative of Missions and Martyrdoms too little known in this country.

"This is a notice of the martyrs who have fallen in this most interesting mission, and of the history of its rise and progress up to the present day."—*Tablet*.

"No one can read this interesting volume without the most genuine admiration of, and sympathy with, such zeal and constancy."—*Literary Churchman*.

#### MISSIONARY BIOGRAPHY.

1. *Life of Henry Dorie, Martyr.* Translated by Lady HERBERT. 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s.

"The circulation of such lives as this of Henry Dorie will do much to promote a spirit of zeal, and to move hearts hitherto

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

stagnant because they have not been stirred to the generous deeds which characterise Catholic virtues."—*Tablet*.

## 2. *Théophane Vénard, Martyr in Tonquin.*

Edited by the Same. 2s. ; cloth elegant, 3s.

"The life of this martyr is not so much a biography as a series of letters translated by Lady Herbert, in which the life of Théophane Vénard unfolds itself by degrees, and in the most natural and interesting way. His disposition was affectionate, and formed for ardent friendship ; hence, his correspondence is full of warmth and tenderness, and his love of his sister in particular is exemplary and striking. During ten years he laboured under Mgr. Retord, in the western district of Tonquin, and his efforts for the conversion of souls were crowned with singular success. During the episcopate of his Bishop no less than 40,000 souls were added to the flock of Christ, and Vénard was peculiarly instrumental in gathering in this harvest."—*Northern Press*.

"We cannot take leave of this little volume without an acknowledgment to Lady Herbert for the excellent English dress in which she has presented it to the British public ; certainly, no lives are more calculated to inspire vocation to the noble work of the apostolic life than those of Dorie and Vénard."—*Tablet*.

## 3. *Life of Bishop Brute.* Edited by the Same.

---

## *The Martyrdom of St. Cecilia: a Drama.*

By ALBANY J. CHRISTIE, S.J. With a Frontispiece after Molitor. Elegant cloth, 5s.

"Well-known and beautiful drama."—*Tablet*.

"The receipt of the fourth edition of this beautiful play assures us that our own opinion of its merits has been shared by a wide circle of the Catholic public. The binding is exquisite, and the picture of St. Cecilia is a work of art."—*Weekly Register*

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

*The Life of M. Olier*, Founder of the Seminary of St. Sulpice; with Notices of his most Eminent Contemporaries. By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Cloth, 4s.

This Biography has received the special approbation of the Abbé Faillon, Author of "La Vie de M. Olier;" and of the Very Reverend Paul Dubreul, D.D., Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Baltimore, U.S.

Edited by the Same.

*The Life of St. Charles Borromeo*. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Also, lately published, by Mr. THOMPSON.

*The Hidden Life of Jesus*: a Lesson and Model to Christians. Translated from the French of BOUDON. Cloth, 3s.

"This profound and valuable work has been very carefully and ably translated by Mr. Thompson. We shall be glad to receive more of that gentleman's publications, for good translation, whether from the French or any other language, is not too common amongst us. The publication is got up with the taste always displayed by the firm of Burns, Oates, and Co."—*Register*.

"The more we have of such works as 'The Hidden Life of Jesus,' the better."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"A book of searching power."—*Church Review*.

"We have often regretted that this writer's works are not better known."—*Universe*.

"We earnestly recommend its study and practice to all readers."—*Tablet*.

"We have to thank Mr. Thompson for this translation of a valuable work which has long been popular in France."—*Dublin Review*.

"A good translation."—*Month*.

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

*Devotion to the Nine Choirs of Holy Angels,*  
and especially to the Angel Guardians. Trans-  
lated from the Same. 3s.

"We congratulate Mr. Thompson on the way in which he has accomplished his task, and we earnestly hope that an increased devotion to the Holy Angels may be the reward of his labour of love."—*Tables*.

"A beautiful translation."—*The Month*.

"The translation is extremely well done."—*Weekly Register*.

*Library of Religious Biography.* Edited by  
EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON.

**VOL. 1. THE LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA, S.J. 5s.**

"We gladly hail the first instalment of Mr. Healy Thompson's Library of Religious Biography. The life before us brings out strongly a characteristic of the Saint which is, perhaps, little appreciated by many who have been attracted to him chiefly by the purity and early holiness which have made him the chosen patron of the young. This characteristic is his intense energy of will, which reminds us of another Saint, of a very different vocation and destiny, whom he is said to have resembled also in personal appearance—the great St. Charles Borromeo."—*Dublin Review*.

"The book before us contains numberless traces of a thoughtful and tender devotion to the Saint. It shows a loving penetration into his spirit, and an appreciation of the secret motives of his action, which can only be the result of a deeply affectionate study of his life and character."—*Month*.

**VOL. 2. THE LIFE OF MARIE EUSTELLE HARPAIN ;  
or, the Angel of the Eucharist. 5s.**

"The life of Marie Eustelle Harpain possesses a special value and interest apart from its extraordinary natural and supernatural beauty, from the fact that to her example and to the effect of her writings is attributed in great measure the wonderful revival of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in France, and consequently throughout Western Christendom."—*Dublin Review*.

"A more complete instance of that life of purity and close union with God in the world of which we have just been speak-

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

ing is to be found in the history of Marie Eustelle Harpain, the sempstress of Saint-Pallais. The writer of the present volume has had the advantage of very copious materials in the French works on which his own work is founded, and Mr. Thompson has discharged his office as editor with his usual diligence and accuracy."—*The Month*.

**VOL. 3. THE LIFE OF ST. STANISLAS KOSTKA. 5s.**

"We strongly recommend this biography to our readers, earnestly hoping that the writer's object may thereby be attained in an increase of affectionate veneration for one of whom Urban VIII. exclaimed that, although 'a little youth,' he was indeed 'a great saint.'"—*Tablet*.

"There has been no adequate biography of St. Stanislas. In rectifying this want, Mr. Thompson has earned a title to the gratitude of English-speaking Catholics. The engaging Saint of Poland will now be better known among us, and we need not fear that, better known, he will not be better loved."—*Weekly Register*.

*The Life of S. Teresa*, written by herself:  
a new Translation from the last Spanish Edition.  
To which is added for the first time in English  
THE RELATIONS, or the Manifestations of her  
Spiritual State which the Saint submitted to her  
Confessors. Translated by DAVID LEWIS. In  
a handsome volume, 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

"The work is incomparable; and Mr. Lewis's rare faithfulness and felicity as a translator are known so well, that no word of ours can be necessary to make the volume eagerly looked for."—*Dublin Review*.

"We have in this grand book perhaps the most copious spiritual autobiography of a Saint, and of a highly-favoured Saint, that exists."—*Month*.

*The Life of Margaret Mary Alacoque.* By  
the Rev. F. TICKELL, S.J. 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

"It is long since we have had such a pleasure as the reading of Father Tickell's book has afforded us. No incident of her holy life from

~~~~~  
BURNS, OATES, & CO, 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

birth to death seems to be wanting, and the volume appropriately closes with an account of her beatification."—*Weekly Register*.

"It is one of those high-class spiritual biographies which will be best appreciated in religious communities."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"Of Father Tickell's labours we can say with pleasure that he has given us a real biography, in which the Saint is everything, and the biographer keeps in the background."—*Dublin Review*.

"We can only hope that the life may carry on, as it is worthy of doing, the apostolate begun in our country by one who our Lord desires should be 'as a brother to His servant, sharing equally in these spiritual goods, united with her to His own Heart for ever.'"—*Tablet*.

"The work could hardly have been done in a more unpretending, and at the same time more satisfactory, manner than in the volume now before us."—*Month*.

*The Day Hours of the Church.* Latin and English. Cloth, 1s.

Also, separately,

THE OFFICES OF PRIME AND COMPLINE. 8d.

THE OFFICES OF TIERCE, SEXT, AND NONE. 3d.

"Prime and Compline are the morning and evening prayers which the Church has drawn up for her children; and, for our part, we can wish for nothing better. We know not where an improvement could be suggested, and therefore we see not why anything should have been substituted for them. . . . Why should not their use be restored? Why should they not become the standard devotions of all Catholics, whether alone or in their families? Why may we not hope to have them more solemnly performed—chanted even every day in all religious communities; or, where there is a sufficient number of persons, even in family chapels?"—*Cardinal Wiseman*.

"These beautiful little books, which have received the imprimatur of his Grace the Archbishop, are a zealous priest's answers to the most eminent Cardinal's questions—such answers as would have gladdened his heart could they have been given when first demanded. But the Cardinal lives in his successors

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

---

*Our Father: Popular Discourses on the Lord's Prayer.* By Dr. EMANUEL VEITH, Preacher in Ordinary in the Cathedral of Vienna. (Dr. V. is one of the most eminent preachers on the Continent.) Cloth, 3s. 6d.

"We can heartily recommend these as accurate, devotional, and practical."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"We are happy to receive and look over once more this beautiful work on the Lord's Prayer—most profitable reading."—*Weekly Register*.

"Most excellent manual."—*Church Review*.

---

*Little Book of the Love of God.* By Count STOLBERG. With Life of the Author. Cloth, 2s.

"An admirable little treatise, perfectly adapted to our language and modes of thought."—*Bishop of Birmingham*.

---

NEW BOOK FOR HOLY COMMUNION.

*Reflections and Prayers for Holy Communion.*

Translated from the French. Uniform with "Imitation of the Sacred Heart." With Preface by Archbishop MANNING. Fcp. 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.; bound, red edges, 5s.; calf, 8s.; morocco, 9s.

"The Archbishop has marked his approval of the work by writing a preface for it, and describes it as 'a valuable addition to our books of devotion.' We may mention that it contains 'two very beautiful methods of hearing Mass,' to use the words of the Archbishop in the Preface."—*Register*.

"A book rich with the choicest and most profound Catholic devotions."—*Church Review*.

---

BURNS, OATE, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

***Holy Confidence.* By FATHER ROGACCI, of the Society of Jesus. One vol. 18mo, cloth, 2s.**

"As an attack on the great enemy, despair, no work could be more effective; while it adds another to a stock of books of devotion which is likely to be much prized."—*Weekly Register*.

"This little book, addressed to those 'who strive to draw nearer to God and to unite themselves more closely with Him,' is one of the most useful and comforting that we have read for a long time. We earnestly commend this little book to all troubled souls, feeling sure that they will find in it abundant cause for joy and consolation."—*Tablet*.

***The Invitation Heeded: Reasons for a Return to Catholic Unity.* By JAMES KENT STONE, late President of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, and of Hobart College. Cloth, 5s. 6d.**

"A very important contribution to our polemical literature, which can hardly fail to be a standard work on the Anglican controversy."—*Dr. Brownson in the New York Tablet*.

\*.\* Of this able work 3000 have already been sold in America.

***The New Testament Narrative, in the Words of the Sacred Writers. With Notes, Chronological Tables, and Maps.* A book for those who, as a matter of education or of devotion, wish to be thoroughly well acquainted with the Life of our Lord. What is narrated by each of His Evangelists is woven into a continuous and chronological narrative. Thus the study of the Gospels is complete and yet easy. Cloth, 2s.**

"The compilers deserve great praise for the manner in which they have performed their task. We commend this little volume as well and carefully printed, and as furnishing its readers, more—

**BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.**

---

and what he so greatly desired should be done is in progress of full performance."—*Tablet*.

"The publication of these Offices is another proof of what we have before alluded to, viz., the increased liturgical taste of the present day."—*Catholic Opinion*

---

### POPULAR DEVOTION.

Now ready.

*Devotions for the Ecclesiastical Seasons*, consisting of Psalms, Hymns, Prayers, &c., suited for Evening Services, and arranged for Singing. Cloth, 1s. Also in separate Nos. at 2d. each, for distribution, as follows:—

- |                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Advent and Christmas.   | 4. Whitsuntide.             |
| 2. Septuagesima to Easter. | 5. Sundays after Pentecost. |
| 3. Paschal Time.           | 6. Feasts of our Lady.      |
| 7. Saints' Days.           |                             |

Music for the whole, 1s. 6d.

"A valuable addition to our stock of popular devotions."  
—*Dublin Review*.

---

*Church Music and Church Choirs*: 1. The Music to be Sung; 2. The proper Singers; 3. The Place for the Choir. 2s.

"The special value of this pamphlet, and the seasonableness of its circulation, lie in this: that it attempts to solve—and, we believe, does really solve—several important points as to the proper kinds of music to be used in our public Offices, and more especially at High Mass."—*Tablet*.

"We earnestly recommend all who can do so to procure and study this pamphlet."—*Weekly Register*.

"Masterly and exhaustive articles."—*Catholic Opinion*.

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO, 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

---

*Liturgical Directions for Organists, Singers, and Composers.* Contains the Instructions of the Holy See on the proper kind of Music for the Church, from the Council of Trent to the present time; and thus furnishes choirs with a guide for selection. Fcp. 8vo, 6d.

---

*New Meditations for each Day in the Year* on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. By a Father of the Society of Jesus. With the imprimatur of his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster. Second Edition. Vols. I. and II., price 4s. 6d. each; or complete in two vols., 9s.

"We can heartily recommend this book for its style and substance; it bears with it several strong recommendations. . . . It is solid and practical without being dreary or commonplace." *Westminster Gazette*.

"A work of great practical utility, and we give it our earnest recommendation."—*Weekly Register*.

---

*The Day Sanctified: being Meditations and Spiritual Readings for Daily Use.* Selected from the Works of Saints and approved writers of the Catholic Church. Fcp., cloth, 3s. 6d.; red edges, 4s.

"Of the many volumes of meditation on sacred subjects which have appeared in the last few years, none has seemed to us so well adapted to its object as the one before us,"—*Tablet*.

"Deserves to be specially mentioned."—*Month*.

"Admirable in every sense."—*Church Times*.

"Many of the Meditations are of great beauty. . . . They form, in fact, excellent little sermons, and we have no doubt will be largely used as such."—*Literary Churchman*.

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

---

over, with a great amount of useful information in the tables inserted at the end."—*Month*.

"It is at once clear, complete, and beautiful."—*Catholic Opinion*.

---

*Balmez: Protestantism and Catholicism*  
 compared in their Effects upon European Civilisation. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

\*.\* A new edition of this far-famed Treatise.

---

*The See of St. Peter.* By T. W. ALLIES.  
 A new and improved edition, with Preface on the present State of the Controversy. 4s. 6d.

---

*Lallemand's Doctrine of the Spiritual Life.*  
 Edited by Dr. FABER. New Edition. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

"This excellent work has a twofold value, being both a biography and a volume of meditations. Father Lallemand's life does not abound with events, but its interest lies chiefly in the fact that his world and his warfare were within. His 'Spiritual Doctrine' contains an elaborate analysis of the wants, dangers, trials, and aspirations of the inner man, and supplies to the thoughtful and devout reader the most valuable instructions for the attainment of heavenly wisdom, grace, and strength."—*Catholic Times*.

"A treatise of the very highest value."—*Month*.

"The treatise is preceded by a short account of the writer's life, and has had the wonderful advantage of being edited by the late Father Faber."—*Weekly Register*.

"One of the very best of Messrs. Burns and Co.'s publications is this new edition of F. Lallemand's 'Spiritual Doctrine.'"—*Westminster Gazette*.

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

*The Rivers of Damascus and Jordan: a*  
Causerie. By a Tertiary of the Order of St.  
Dominick. 4s.

"Good solid reading."—*Month*.

"Well done, and in a truly charitable spirit."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"It treats the subject in so novel and forcible a light, that we are fascinated in spite of ourselves, and irresistibly led on to follow its arguments and rejoice at its conclusions."—*Tablet*.

*Eudoxia: a Tale of the Fifth Century.*  
From the German of IDA, COUNTESS HAHN-  
HAHN. Cloth elegant, 4s.

"This charming tale may be classed among such instructive as well as entertaining works as 'Fabiola' and 'Callista.' It adds another laurel to the brow of the fair Countess."—*Weekly Register*.

"Instructive and interesting book."—*Northern Press*.

*Tales for the Many.* By CYRIL AUSTIN.  
In Five Numbers, at 2d. each; also, cloth, 1s.;  
gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

"Calculated to do good in our lending-libraries."—*Tablet*.

"We wish the volume all the success it deserves, and shall always welcome with pleasure any effort from the same quarter."—*Weekly Register*.

"One of the most delightful books which Messrs. Burns and Oates have brought out to charm children at this festive season."—*Catholic Opinion*.

*In the Snow; or, Tales of Mount St.*  
Bernard. By the Rev Dr. ANDERDON. Cloth  
neat, 3s. 6d.

"A collection of pretty stories."—*Star*.

"An excellent book for a present."—*Universe*.

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

"A capital book of stories."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"An agreeable book."—*Church Review*.

"An admirable fireside companion."—*Nation*.

"A very interesting volume of tales."—*Freeman*.

"Several successive stories are related by different people assembled together, and thus a greater scope is given for variety, not only of the matter, but also the tone of each story, according to the temper and position of the narrators. Beautifully printed, tastefully bound, and reflects great credit on the publishers."

"A pleasing contribution."—*Month*.

"A charming volume. We congratulate Catholic parents and children on the appearance of a book which may be given by the former with advantage, and read by the latter with pleasure and edification."—*Dublin Review*.

By the same Author.

*The Seven Ages of Clarewell: A History of a Spot of Ground.* Cloth, 3s.

"We have an attractive work from the pen of an author who knows how to combine a pleasing and lively style with the promotion of the highest principles and the loftiest aims. The volume before us is beautifully bound, in a similar way to 'In the Snow,' by the same author, and is therefore very suitable for a present."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"A pleasing novelty in the style and character of the book, which is well and clearly sustained in the manner it is carried out."—*Northern Press*.

"Each stage furnishes the material for a dramatic scene; are very well hit off, and the whole makes up a graphic picture."—*Month*.

"'Clarewell' will give not only an hour of pleasant reading, but will, from the nature of the subject, be eminently suggestive of deep and important truths."—*Tablet*.

WORKS BY LADY GEORGLANA FULLERTON.

*Life of Mary Fitzgerald, a Child of the Sacred Heart.* Price 1s.; cloth extra, 2s.

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

---

WORKS BY LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON (continued).

*Rose Leblanc.* A Tale of great interest.  
Cloth, 3s.

*Grantley Manor.* (The well-known and favourite Novel). Cloth, 3s.; cheap edition, 2s. 6d.

*Life of St. Frances of Rome.* Neat cloth, 2s. 6d.; cheap edition, 1s. 8d.

Edited by the Same.

*Our Lady's Little Books.* Neat cloth, 2s.; separate Numbers, 4d. each.

*Life of the Honourable E. Dormer,* late of the 60th Rifles. 1s.; cloth extra, 2s.

*Helpers of the Holy Souls.* 6d.

---

*Tales from the Diary of a Sister of Mercy.*

By C. M. BRAME.

CONTENTS: The Double Marriage—The Cross and the Crown—The Novice—The Fatal Accident—The Priest's Death—The Gambler's Wife—The Apostate—The Besetting Sin.

Beautifully bound in bevelled cloth, 3s. 6d.

"Written in a chaste, simple, and touching style."—*Tablet*.

"This book is a casket; and those who open it will find the gem within."—*Register*.

"Calculated to promote the spread of virtue, and to check that of vice; and cannot fail to have a good effect upon all—young and old—into whose hands it may fall."—*Nation*.

"A neat volume, composed of agreeable and instructive tales."

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

Each of its tales concludes with a moral, which supplies food for reflection."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"They are well and cleverly told, and the volume is neatly got up."—*Month*.

"Very well told; all full of religious allusions and expressions."—*Star*.

"Very good written, and life-like—many very pathetic."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"An excellent work; reminds us forcibly of Father Price's 'Sick Calls.'"—*Universe*.

"A very interesting series of tales."—*Sun*.

By the Same.

*Angels' Visits: A Series of Tales. With Frontispiece and Vignette. 3s. 6d.*

"The tone of the book is excellent, and it will certainly make itself a great favourite with the young."—*Month*.

"Beautiful collection of Angel Stories. All who may wish to give any dear children a book which speaks in tones suited to the sweet simplicity of their innocent young hearts about holy things cannot do better than send for 'Angels' Visits.'"—*Weekly Register*.

"One of the prettiest books for children we have seen."—*Tablet*.

"A book which excites more than ordinary praise. We have great satisfaction in recommending to parents and all who have the charge of children this charming volume."—*Northern Press*.

"A good present for children. An improvement on the 'Diary of a Sister of Mercy.'"—*Universe*.

"Touchingly written, and evidently the emanation of a refined and pious mind."—*Church Times*.

"A charming little book, full of beautiful stories of the family of angels."—*Church Opinion*.

"A nicely-written volume."—*Bookseller*.

"Gracefully-written stories."—*Star*.

Just out, ornamental cloth, 5s.

*Legends of Our Lady and the Saints: or, Our Children's Book of Stories in Verse. Written*

~~~~~  
BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

for the Recitations of the Pupils of the Schools of the Holy Child Jesus, St. Leonards-on-Sea. Cheap Edition, 2s. 6d.

"It is a beautiful religious idea that is realised in the 'Legends of Our Lady and the Saints.' We are bound to add that it has been successfully carried out by the good nuns of St. Leonards. The children of their Schools are unusually favoured in having so much genius and taste exerted for their instruction and delight. The book is very daintily decorated and bound, and forms a charming present for pious children."—*Tablet*.

"The 'Legends' are so beautiful, that they ought to be read by all lovers of poetry."—*Bookseller*.

"Graceful poems."—*Month*.

---

*Edith Sydney: a Tale of the Catholic Movement.* By MISS OXENHAM. 5s.

"A novel for the novel-reader, and at the same time it is a guide to the convert and a help to their instructors."—*Universe*.

"Miss Oxenham shows herself to be a fair writer of a controversial tale, as well as a clever delineator of character."—*Tablet*.

"A charming romance. We introduce 'Edith Sydney' to our readers, confident that she will be a safe and welcome visitor in many a domestic circle, and will attain high favour with the Catholic reading public."—*Nation*.

"Miss Oxenham seems to possess considerable powers for the delineation of character and incident."—*Month*.

---

*Not Yet: a Tale of the Present Time.* By MISS OXENHAM. 5s.

"The lighter order of Catholic literature receives a very welcome addition in this story, which is original and very striking. The author is mistress of a style which is light and pleasant. The work is one to which we can give our heartiest commendation."—*Cork Examiner*.

"We are indebted to Miss Oxenham for one of the most in-

---

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

teresting sensational Catholic tales yet published."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"Wholesome and pleasant reading, evincing a refined and cultivated understanding."—*Union Review*.

"Miss Oxenham's work would rank well even among Mudie's novels, although its one-volume form is likely to be unfavourable in the eyes of ordinary novel-readers; but, in nine cases out of ten, a novelette is more effective than a regular novel, and any more padding would have merely diluted the vivid and unflagging interest which the authoress of 'Not Yet' has imparted to her elegantly-bound volume. The plot is as original as a plot can be; it is well laid and carefully and ably worked out."—*Westminster Gazette*.

*Nellie Netterville: a Tale of Ireland in the Time of Cromwell.* By CECILIA CADDELL, Author of "Wild Times." 5s.; cheap edition, 3s. 6d.

"A very interesting story. The author's style is pleasing, picturesque, and good, and we recommend our readers to obtain the book for themselves."—*Church News*.

"A tale well told and of great interest."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"Pretty pathetic story—well told."—*Star*.

"Pretty book—history of cruelties inflicted by Protestant domination in the sister country—full of stirring and affecting passages."—*Church Review*.

"Tale is well told, and many of the incidents, especially the burning of the chapel with the priest and congregation by the Cromwellian soldiers, are intensely interesting."—*Universe*.

"By a writer well known, whose reputation will certainly not suffer by her new production."—*Month*.

*Marie; or, the Workwoman of Liège.* By CECILIA CADDELL. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

"This is another of those valuable works like that of 'Marie Eustelle Harpain.' Time would fail us were we to enumerate

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 63, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

either her marvellous acts of charity, or the heroic sufferings she endured for the sake of others, or the wonderful revelations with which her faith and charity were rewarded."—*Tablet*.

"The author of 'Wild Times,' and other favourite works, is to be congratulated on the issue of a volume which is of more service than any book of fiction, however stirring. It is a beautiful work—beautiful in its theme and in its execution."—*Weekly Register*.

"Miss Caddell has given us a very interesting biography of 'Marie Sellier, the Workwoman of Liège,' known in the 17th century as 'Sœur Marie Albert.' Examples such as that so gracefully set forth in this volume are much needed among us."—*Month*.

---

*The Countess of Glosswood: a Tale of the Times of the Stuarts.* From the French. 3s. 6d.

"The tale is well written, and the translation seems cleverly done."—*Month*.

"This volume is prettily got up, and we can strongly recommend it to all as an excellent and instructive little book to place in the hands of the young."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"An excellent translation, and a very pretty tale, well told."—*Catholic Opinion*.

"This is a pretty tale of a Puritan conversion in the time of Charles II., prettily got up, and a pleasing addition to our lending-libraries."—*Tablet*.

"This tale belongs to a class of which we have had to thank Messrs. Burns for many beautiful specimens. Such books, while they are delightful reading to us who are happily Catholics, have another important merit—they set forth the claims of Catholicism, and must do a vast deal of good among Protestants who casually meet with and peruse them. The book before us is beautifully got up, and would be an ornament to any table."—*Weekly Register*.





